

A MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR FIRST-YEAR GRADUATE TEACHERS
WITHOUT BACHELOR'S DEGREES

by

JOHN ALLAN PROOLTON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1964

Copyright 1994
by
John Allen Whitehead

To the memory of my father,
Elder L. A. Whitlatch.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the support given by those who contributed to this study. Sincere appreciation goes to the members of the supervisory committee, Dr. James H. Longstrech, chairman, without whose support and guidance the completion of this project would not have been possible, and Dr. Susan G. Johnson and Dr. Michael T. Sweeney for their advice and timely suggestions.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert E. Schenk, Jr., who offered helpful advice, and Mr. John Scoville, who shared raw data which contributed to the timely completion of this project. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Theresa E. Vermeulen, who read portions of the manuscript and proffered advice and suggestions.

Supportive gratitude is extended to my family, Eugene, LaToya, John III, and Kellie, for their constant support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ix
ABSTRACT	xviii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
General Methods	4
Limitations	4
Justification For the Study	5
Assumptions	8
Definitions of Terms	9
Procedures	10
Organization of the Study	12
II CRITERIA FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION BASED ON A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Organization of Programs for Substitute Teacher Preparation	14
Methods of Delivery for Substitute Teacher Preparation Programs	20
Performance Evaluation of Substitute Teachers	23
A Composite List of the Recommended Criteria	26
III OPINIONS OF PRACTITIONERS RELATIVE TO THE SELECTED CRITERIA FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION	28
Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Program Organization For Substitute Teacher Preparation	29
Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Curriculum Content For Substitute Teacher Preparation	37
Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Methods of Delivery For a Substitute Teacher Preparation Program	52
Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Performance Evaluation of Substitute Teachers	59
Summary of the Practitioners in Brief	48
Comparison of the Interview Results with the Recommended Criteria	57
Comparison Results in Brief	75

CHAPTER	Page
IV DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM	75
Comparison of the Criteria with Sooner's Guidelines for In-Service Training Programs for Substitute Teachers	76
Modification of Sooner's Training Components	85
Comparison of the Modified Training Components with Lawrence's Systems of Effective In-Service Education	87
Projection of the Model Preparation Program	98
V EVALUATION AND FINAL REVISION OF THE MODEL	107
Collection of the Evaluation Assessment	107
Questionnaire Results	108
Comparison Data and Evaluation Results	110
Recommendations for Improving the Model	110
Final Revision of the Model	114
VI SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	120
Summary	120
Conclusions and Implications	125
REFERENCES	130
APPENDIX	
A GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWING PRACTITIONERS REGARDING CRITERIA FOR A PROGRAM FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION	135
B QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EVALUATION OF THE MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR FIRST-YEAR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS	138
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ENTRY	139

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM FOR FIRST-YEAR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS
WITHOUT MASTERS'S DEGREES

by

John Allen Whitham

December 1988

Chairman: James M. Longstrech
Major Department: Educational Administration and Supervision

The purpose of this study was the development and evaluation of a model preparation program for substitute teachers who possess neither a bachelor's degree nor regular teacher certification. Twenty-six recommended criteria were developed from a review of the literature. The recommended criteria include the following areas: (a) program expectations, (b) curriculum content, (c) methods of delivery, and (d) evaluation. It was beyond the scope of this study to provide in-depth instruction in the subject content areas for substitute teachers.

Eighteen practitioners—directors of staff development, principals, regular teachers, and substitute teachers—from seven Florida school districts were interviewed to determine their opinions relative to substitute teacher preparation. The opinions of the practitioners were consistent with 16 of the 26 criteria recommended in the literature.

A model preparation program for substitute teachers was developed from the criteria derived from the literature, the opinions of

practitioners, Cooper's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers, and Lounsbury's guidelines of effective in-service education.

The model preparation program was evaluated by a panel of experts. The panelists were asked to respond to an established questionnaire which was derived from the criteria obtained from the literature and interviews with practitioners. The questionnaire was designed to elicit whether or not the model conformed to the criteria. The panelists were asked to respond to the questionnaire on a 5-point scale. The responses of the panelists were tabulated for each questionnaire item (criteria). The model was found to conform to each of the criteria according to the established standard (i.e., two of three responses at level 4 or above) for agreement. An analysis of the total responses revealed that the panelists perceived the model to be consistent with the criteria derived from the literature and interviews with the practitioners.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Proficiency is essential for quality teaching. Since the early 1980s increased attention has been directed toward the need to improve the level of preparation of school teachers. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), in its report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, recommended that 'persons preparing to teach . . . be required to meet high educational standards' (p. 20). The State of Florida in 1979 took steps to improve the level of preparation for persons entering the teaching profession. As a result, all new teachers in Florida must possess at least a bachelor's degree, pass an examination, and complete a one-year beginning teacher-training program prior to being issued a regular teaching certificate.

While steps have been taken to improve the level of preparation of the regular classroom teacher, very little attention has been given to requirements for the preparation of substitute teachers who replace regular teachers when they are absent for reasons including sickness, professional meetings, personal business, temporary duty elsewhere, military leave, military leave, etc. Hines (1981), in his review of Florida Statute 204, stated that "It is now the responsibility of each individual school board to adopt rules prescribing the qualification, compensation, and the procedure for employment of all substitute teachers" (p. 28). Very little attention has been given to the preparation of substitute teachers even though their role in education has become more substantial. Ellison and Mathews (1977) reported that the

time allowed by teacher contracts for absences was increasing and that greater numbers of substitute teachers would be required to implement these contracts.

In 1977, Educational Research Services, Inc. (ERS) completed a study showing that about four substitute teachers were employed daily for every 100 full-time teachers. Therefore, a district with 1,000 teachers could be expected to employ approximately 40 substitutes daily, which would require 7,700 substitute days each academic year. Elliott (1981) stated that "during one school year substitutes taught one million teacher-days throughout the nation" (p. 30). Drake (1981) cited studies showing that on the average students have "10 of their total classroom days each year supervised by a substitute teacher" (p. 74). The role of the substitute teacher is substantial and growing larger.

Elliott and Reslow (1977) reported the results of a study in Indiana which revealed that the total number of substitute days was increasing. "80% of all districts reporting indicated steady increases over the last five-year period, even though the overall number of teachers and students declined" (p. 201). Reynolds and Garfield (1975) reported that "the use of substitutes in the Pittsburgh School System increased 60% from 1966 to 1970 and totaled 25,000 teaching days in 1969-70" (p. 44).

While the number of substitute teachers has been growing, very little has been done to prepare substitute teachers for their role. In many states, including the State of Florida, no state standards have existed relative to the preparation of substitute teachers. Schenck (1977) in press) found that 74.4% of the school districts in Florida did not

require the same academic degree for substitute teachers as for regular teachers (p. 37). He also found that 68.75 of the school districts in Florida did not provide preservice or orientation programs for substitute teachers and that 68.75 did not provide in-service programs for substitute teachers (p. 70A).

Clift and Fackler cited a report of the New York Metropolitan School Study Council that showed substitute teachers to be significantly less effective in classrooms than regular teachers. They cited research showing a relationship between substitutes in school time and decreases in student achievement. They further found that the use of ineffective substitute teachers in classrooms contributed a "cutback in schooling time and hence achievement" (p. 388).

Scenes (1982a in press) stated that "what is generally desired of the substitute teachers is the maintenance of a continuous instructional program of the same quality as that given by the regular teacher" (p. 1). Scenes (1973) suggested that,

If the substitute teacher is to be a positive contribution to the educational process, he must be more than a "fill-in" or a "warm body" . . . Unfortunately, it appears that many school districts and state departments of education have not yet developed adequate policies and procedures such that the substitute teacher program provides for the continuity of instruction and the educational progress of students. (p. 17)

Scenes (1980) suggested that one method of ensuring the maintenance of a continuous instructional program was to provide training for substitute teachers. He developed guidelines for in-service programs for substitute teachers. Because of the need for training substitute teachers and the availability of guidelines, the present study, described in the paragraphs that follow, was prepared.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was the development and evaluation of a model preparation program for substitute teachers who possess either a bachelor's degree or regular teacher certification. The model preparation program was designed for use immediately preceding and during the first year of substitute teacher service. Attention was given to program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, and evaluation of the participants in the program. The model was based on criteria derived from a review of the literature, interviews with practitioners, guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers developed by Gowan (1980), and Lawrence's (1980) Patterns of Effective Inservice Education.

Delimitations

The development of the model was confined to a review of the literature on the needs of substitute teachers for preparation, interviews with 10 practitioners located in three school districts within the State of Florida that had in-service programs for substitute teachers, guidelines for in-service training programs developed by Gowan, and Lawrence's Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. The development of the model was the activity of the researcher. Evaluation of the model was accomplished by a panel of experts consisting of a staff member of a university teacher center, a director of staff development, and a principal.

Limitations

Though field testing was beyond the scope of the study, the lack of a field test to determine the effectiveness of the model constitutes

a major limitation of the study. The model was designed for Florida and was developed for substitute teachers who do not possess a bachelor's degree or regular teacher certification. There are substitute teachers who possess bachelor's degrees and regular teacher certification, but this model presentation program was not designed to meet their needs.

Justification for the Study

Addressed in the study was a major practical problem in education. Jitroff and Marjorie (1977) reported that teacher absences have increased drastically in many school systems, and that the increases have had a negative effect on instructional programs in the schools.

Research demonstrating that cutbacks in school time bring about cutbacks in student achievement was reported by Jitroff and Marjorie. They also reported research which showed substitute teachers to be significantly less effective in classroom than regular teachers. They equated the use of ineffective substitute teachers in the classroom with cutting back school time and thus significantly affecting student achievement. They further suggested that school officials are bargaining away pupil progress with more liberal provisions for "lost days." Thus, as the time allowed by teacher contracts for absences increases, greater numbers of substitute teachers are required to implement bargaining contracts.

The Education Standards Commission (1981) estimated that substitute teachers were utilized by Florida schools for over 700,000 days, the approximate equivalent of 4,000 full-time teachers (p. 1).

As previously stated, in many states, including the State of Florida, there were no state standards relative to the preparation of substitute teachers. Schenk (1984a, p. 100) found that in Florida 84.4% of the school districts did not require the same academic degree for substitute teachers as for regular teachers, and that 74.7% of the school districts did not require the same certification for substitute teachers as for regular teachers (p. 81). Schenk also found that 81.7% of the school districts in Florida did not provide preservice or orientation programs for substitute teachers and 88.7% did not provide in-service programs for substitute teachers (p. 106). Thus, students are placed in classroom every day of their school careers with substitute teachers having questionable levels of preparation. The lack of uniform standards for preparation of substitute teachers poses a threat to the quality of the instructional program in some schools.

Richard C. Spillane, Executive Director of the Education Standards Commission of the State of Florida, stated (in a memorandum dated March 22, 1984): "The Education Standards Commission believes that the present regulations governing substitute certification are ineffective and therefore do not serve to protect the public interest. The Education Standards Commission recommends that these rules be substantially strengthened" (p. 1). The Education Standards Commission proposed recommendations for changes to State Board of Education rule 6A-6.04(5), which defines Florida teaching certification. Among the proposed changes was the recommendation that all applicants for a substitute certificate must possess (a) a minimum a regular high school diploma. The Commission further proposed that all substitute,

or potential substitute, teachers be required to attend and satisfactorily complete a training session sponsored by the school district and dealing with effective classroom management skills (p. 15). It was also proposed that the renewal of a substitute teacher certificate be based on criteria which include satisfactory completion of three semester hours of university course work, or a combination of 40 in-service points (p. 43).

The model preparation program proposed in this study addresses the needs of those school districts in Florida that employ substitute teachers who neither a bachelor's degree nor regular teacher certification. The study provides a model program to be utilized as a guide for those school districts to upgrade the level of performance of substitute teachers. The study model should help school districts meet the training and recertification requirements proposed by the Florida Educative Standards Committee.

The review of the literature indicated a dearth of knowledge concerning substitute teachers. Jensen and Vochell (1980) stated that "little research exists concerning substitute teachers, with the result that they are frequently employed and dismissed on the basis of guesswork" (p. 44). Perkins (1986) stated that less was known about substitute teachers than any other group approaching comparable size. Drake (1981) pointed out that "while countless facets of today's educational process are being improved, the problem of substitute teaching remains largely ignored" (p. 14). In 1988 there were no studies which provided a model preparation program for substitute teachers without a bachelor's degree or regular teacher certification.

Therefore, it was believed that the study could make a contribution to the knowledge base on substitute teachers.

The development of a model preparation program for substitute teachers without bachelor's degrees and regular certification was a logical sequence to Schenck's (1982/In press) and Gosses's (1984) studies. Schenck found that there were no state standards relative to the preparation of substitute teachers in Florida, that a large majority of the districts in the state had failed to set their requirements for academic preparation and certification for substitute teachers equivalent to those set for regular teachers, and that the majority of the districts were not providing orientation and in-service education programs for substitute teachers. These findings demonstrate the need for a preparation program for substitute teachers without a bachelor's degree and regular teacher certification. This need, coupled with Gosses's development of guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers, sets the model preparation program proposed in the study a logical next step.

Assumptions

Three assumptions are basic to this study:

1. Maintenance of continuity of instruction when the regular teacher is absent is important.
2. Continuity of instruction is more likely to be maintained if the substitute teacher is properly prepared.
3. Because some of the school districts in Florida hire substitute teachers who do not have the proper preparation for teaching, there is a need for a model preparation program that can be used with or without prior certification.

Definition of Items

Standards: Standards which represent recommended practices, as determined through the literature and interviews with practitioners, for conducting a substitute teacher preparation program.

Curriculum content: Subject matter pertaining to the preparation of subjects for substitute teaching.

Experiential impact: Interaction with the learning situation in such a way that the experience will have some impact that will affect the learner's behavior.

In-service education: Preparation relative to substitute teacher service which begins after the teacher begins work.

Methods of delivery: The means by which the subject matter of the model preparation program is delivered to the participants. Methods may include lectures, illustrated lectures, demonstrations, observations, interviewing, brainstorming, group discussions, team sessions, role-playing, and guided practice.

Model preparation program: A preparation program developed from a review of the literature and interviews with practitioners in selected Florida school districts relative to the preparation of substitute teachers.

Panel of experts: A three-member panel of knowledgeable persons consisting of a staff member of a university teacher center who regularly provides in-service training for school personnel, a district director of staff development, and a principal.

Transferable skills: Measurement to determine whether the participants in the preparation program have attained the objectives of the program.

Practitioners. School district personnel directly involved in substitute teaching or the training and supervision of substitute teachers: directors of staff development, principals, substitute teachers, and regular teachers.

Pre-service education. Preparation for substitute teacher service which takes place prior to or upon initial entry into the substitute teaching service.

Regular teacher. A person who is employed under contract as a full-time teacher and who is assigned to a specific grade level or area of specialization.

Substitute teacher. A person selected to replace a regular teacher who is absent from the classroom.

Procedures

The study was developed in three phases. The first phase was the development of a set of criteria to guide the development of the model, which was done on the basis of a literature review and interviews with practitioners. The second phase of the study was the development of the model, which was accomplished by comparing the criteria derived in phase one with Lawrence's guidelines (components) for in-service training programs for substitute teachers, and modifying the criteria and guidelines to form modified training components. The modified training components were then compared with Lawrence's Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. The results of this comparison were used to project a model preparation program. The third phase was the evaluation and the revision of the model.

Development of the Criteria for Substitutes

The study was begun with a review of the related literature. This review involved a study of the available research, including doctoral dissertations, book materials, authoritative journal articles, and other published or unpublished information related to substitute teacher preparation. The focus of the review of the literature was to develop a list of recommended criteria. The recommended criteria were developed on program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, and evaluation of substitute teachers. The literature-derived recommended criteria were used to develop an interview guide.

Interviews were conducted in three school districts to determine the opinions of practitioners relative to substitute teacher preparation. The director of staff development, a principal, two regular teachers, and two substitute teachers were interviewed in each of three school districts identified by Schuch (1983) as having in-service programs for substitute teachers. The practitioners were interviewed on program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, and evaluation of substitute teachers relative to in-service programs for substitute teachers. The data obtained from the review of the literature and the opinions of the practitioners were used to develop the criteria for the model.

Development of the Model

The criteria developed in phase one were compared with Gossett's (1980) guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers. The results of the comparison were used to modify Gossett's training components. The modified training components were then compared with

Lawrence's Handbook of Effective Inservice Education. The results of this comparison were used to project the model. The projected model was a composite of the literature-derived criteria, guidelines by Gossett and effective programs for training by Lawrence. The researcher did not eliminate any data elements. The decision to retain or reject data was made by an expert panel.

Evaluation of the Model

The model was evaluated by a panel of experts, consisting of a staff leader of a university teacher center who regularly provided in-service training for personnel in Florida school districts, a district director of staff development, and a principal who supervised substitute teachers in the classroom. The model, along with an evaluation history, which was derived from the criteria, was submitted to a panel of experts. The results from the evaluation were used to refine the model.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II contains a review of the literature related to substitute teacher preparation and the development of recommended criteria for a preparation program for substitute teachers. Chapter III consists of the opinions of practitioners relative to substitute teacher preparation compiled from the TSM interviews in three Florida school districts which reportedly had inservice programs for substitute teachers. Chapter IV presents a comparison of the criteria for substitute teacher preparation with Gossett's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers, a projection of the modified components, a comparison of the modified components with Lawrence's Handbook of Effective Inservice Education, and a projection of a model. Chapter V consists of the evaluation information compiled from the panel of experts. Chapter VI contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER III
CRITERIA FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION
BASED ON A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the first comprehensive study, by Gagnon (1953), of substitute teacher service in the public schools in Ohio, researchers have continued to identify the need to provide better preparation for substitute teachers. In 1984 Saltside stated that "inservice training for substitute teachers should be so planned and so administered as to assure a maximum of service and professional growth" (p. 10). In 1981 Leslie stated that "districts should assess the skills and information especially needed by their school substitutes and create a program to improve effectiveness" (p. 31).

Even though researchers have continued to identify the need for substitute teachers to be better prepared, very little appears to have been done to address the problem. Goolsby (1982) observed that "the professional development, situations, and problems of the substitute teacher have not been a topic of vital concern for researchers or practitioners in the field of educational administration" (p. 153). Goman (1984) went beyond identifying the need for substitute teachers to be better prepared and addressed the problem by developing guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers. The guidelines for his "inservice training program were developed to aid substitute teachers in the cultivation of the operational competencies essential to their duties in the school district" (p. 34).

Rosen (1980) found that relatively few research studies had been conducted concerning substitute teacher service prior to 1960, with the limits of all the literature on the subject having been published since 1960. He reported that of 160 articles concerning the substitute teacher listed in the Education Index during 1925-1964, 106 appeared after 1960 (p. 21). After analyzing 17 textbooks on educational administration and supervision and on personnel management, he found the subject of substitute teachers mentioned in only a few paragraphs or pages. He found the literature on substitute teacher programs to be descriptive, discursive, and/or opinionative in nature, in addition to being limited. However, he found the literature to be generally representative of the major research that had been done.

Although the articles often contain a description of the programs in various school systems or a report of an experience that a substitute teacher underwent as an assignment, the articles often reviewed opinions as to the strengths and weakness of various aspects of substitute teacher service that have been pointed out in reports of major research and were or less summarized by writers who have given considerable attention to the subject (p. 21).

The review of the literature that follows is organized in sections on program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, and performance evaluation. Following each section the related criteria are developed. At the end of the review the completed set of criteria are presented.

Organization of Programs for Substitute Teacher Preparation

Barris and Barrett (1981) suggested the laboratory approach as a basic design for one or more in-service education sessions. The design elements of the laboratory approach are as follows:

1. The participant is actively involved in solving a problem.
2. The problem situation is simulated as realistically as possible.
3. Quantifiable data are produced and recorded to reveal the nature of the response of the participants.
4. Feedback on data is provided to permit each participant to contrast his reactions with those of the larger group or other groups.
5. Data are discussed and analyzed so as to lead to generalizations and implications for practice. [p. 45]

Ravitz and Bellandi reported that planning is essential prior to implementing the laboratory approach. They reported that planning should include specifying objectives, developing materials, and designing procedures.

Agnew and Garfield (1967) reported on a pilot program to substitute teacher training in the Pittsburgh school system. The training program was divided into a five-day workshop and a five-day apprenticeship period. Agnew and Garfield reported that the workshop period constituted a "crash" methods course and the apprenticeship phase consisted of five weekly classroom observations of the substitute teacher by training staff members.

The development of a 10-week course in substitute teaching which was offered as a part of the evening adult program was reported by Kraft (1962). He also suggested that the prospective substitute teacher be required to spend time in the classroom observing the teachers and students in action.

McLure and Hughes (1962) reported the development of 20 two-hour in-service training classes that specifically address the special demands that face substitute teachers. These classes were called Substitute Teacher Education Modules (STEMs). The STEMs were taught

by university professors, classroom teachers, or experienced substitute teachers. At the start of each module, each participant received a small handbook containing the SDP objectives, a transcript of class materials, and sample examination questions and answers. Participants were required to pass a qualifying examination that tested their mastery of the techniques covered in the module. McIntire and Rogers reported that each substitute teacher was required to complete 12 SDPs (24 hours of instruction) and to pass the accompanying qualifying examination in order to qualify for additional pay over a three-year period.

Johnson and Pankell (1978) described a one-month summer institute for substitute teachers. During the institute, the substitute teachers met the staff and developed instructional units in different subject areas. The instructional units were used later by the substitute teachers when they replaced the regular teacher in the classroom.

Harris and Rossini printed out some differences in characteristics of commonly used designs.

A lecture-questioning design, for instance, makes no attempt to simulate reality. Input/output is very limited, no data are produced, and feedback (via questions) is directed toward the presenter rather than toward the participants. The design is very linearizing along with discussion itself involves no reality simulation, but involvement is more highly individual and data are produced. In brainstorming-discussion design the kind of data produced are hardly suitable for systematic analysis via, and a structured observational system is not provided. Since brainstorming data do not grow out of a simulated reality, it is very difficult for participants to generalize and to see direct applications for the ideas. (p. 45)

The design for learning proposed by Harris and Rossini included a planning section, an action section, a measurement section, a feedback and interpretation section, and a follow-up or a new action.

section. The planning section included specifying objectives, developing materials, and designing procedures. The action section included studying the problem, considering the situation, assuming roles, and reacting. The measurement section included recording reactions, quantifying reactions, and analyzing data. The feedback and interpretation section included presenting data and comparing and contrasting. The new action section included applications for follow-up in-service efforts (p. 40).

The number of formal programs for substitute teacher preparation reported in the literature was very limited. However, all of the programs reported in the literature had one or more of the sections proposed by Harris and Bennett.

Based on the literature, the following criteria are recommended for the organization of programs for substitute teacher preparation:

1. A planning section which specified objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities should be included.
2. An action section which provides for studying problems, assuming roles, and reacting to situations should be included.
3. A measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data should be included.
4. A feedback and interpretation section in which data are presented, compared, and contrasted should be included.
5. A new action section for follow-up in-service efforts should be included.

Continuing Growth for Substitute Teacher Preparation

Jordan and McCall (1988) found that "school systems are shifting policy and developing a policy of professional development for substitute teachers" (p. 81). For example, they described

a six-week summer refresher-teacher institute developed for substitute teachers to develop micro-resource units and to meet with administrators, supervisors, guidance and teaching personnel. Micro-resource units included inventions (science), economics and money exchange (social studies), Prevention of Accidents (Health and safety), Communication by Written Language (Language arts), and King Kong (math). The micro-units were taught by the relief teachers when the regular teachers were absent. (p. 81)

Graft (1980) reported that "Being Borealis, N.J., offers a 10-week course in substitute teaching as part of its evening adult program" (p. 80). He further stated that "among the topics discussed are responsibilities of the substitute and the regular teacher, approaches to discipline problems, and emergency situations" (p. 80).

McIntire and Rogers (1982) reported the development of 20 teacher in-service training classes that specifically address the special demands that face substitute teachers. In these classes, called **Substitute Teacher Adaptive Modules (STAMs)**,

participants learn to use behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques, they also study principles of learning that help to provide productive classroom behavior. The module on motivation teaches substitutes how to help students succeed, which in turn improves classroom behavior. Participants learn to set tasks at appropriate levels of difficulty, to vary prompts when needed, and to divide long assignments into many shorter more readily accomplished tasks. Other STAMs emphasize such practical matters as communication skills, the mechanics of filling out school forms, understanding school district policies and state and federal laws, and the use of textbooks and materials adopted by the state. Perhaps the most practical module deals with planning an effective lesson or short unit. (p. 192)

Epstein (1975) states that "a school administrator should discuss disciplinary policies and procedures, fire drill routines, and state liability laws with the substitute" (p. 48). He recommended that during the training session the following topics/techniques should be considered:

(a) how to develop concepts through inductive techniques during a "map session," (b) how to use audiovisual materials which are available in short sections, (c) how to derive questions, word games, and other intellectual exercises which could be used in short sections, and (d) how to utilize preexisting record book accounts to stimulate meaningful discussion (p. 49).

Based on the literature, the following criteria are recommended for the curriculum content for substitute teacher preparation:

1. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher.
2. Substitute teachers should be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures.
3. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the state liability laws pertaining to education.
4. Substitute teachers should be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures.
5. Substitute teachers should be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques.
6. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district policies.
7. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.
8. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers.

- 9) Substitute teachers should be instructed in the principles of learning.
- 10) Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.
- 11) Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to develop microsequence units in subject-matter areas.
- 12) Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to operate audio-visual equipment.
- 13) Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to fill out required school forms.
- 14) Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to motivate students.

Methods of Delivery for Substitute Teacher Preparation Program

Arnold and Garfield (1977) reported on a pilot program to substitute teacher training in the Pittsburgh school system. The training program was divided into a five-day workshop and a five-week apprenticeship period. The behavioral system approach of learning counseling was utilized to develop four principles that formed the "new" substitute teacher role:

1. Change the role of the substitute teacher to that of learning manager rather than information dispenser.
2. The substitute teacher should attend to those students who indicate a willingness to participate in the learning activity.
3. Student control can most easily be achieved from positive reinforcement than from negative sanctions.
4. [Increase] the substitute teacher's sense of professional satisfaction. (pp. 13-14)

Arnold and Garfield reported that the role of the learning manager was demonstrated on videotape. The following behaviors critical to the learning manager role were defined and practiced:

1. Define a specific objective for the 45-minute period.
2. Have the students select the most important ideas and facts from their textbook and present them aloud to the class.
3. Repeat these facts and ideas on the chalkboard. (If sufficient material is placed on the chalkboard, the board becomes a third "textbook," and relationships among the ideas can be further developed.)
4. Repeat and/or reflect student statements so that even the silent students can hear and participate in the learning activity.
5. Ask for learning "output" only after there has been sufficient learning "input."
6. Do not ask students to work as an independent individual until it has been properly demonstrated in front of the entire class by one of the students or the teacher.
7. Summarize the learning that has taken place so that the students and teacher have a sense of "I know it." If the assignment is long or complex, summarize at short intervals (pp. 84-85).

Reynolds and Garfield reported that "to demonstrate these teaching behaviors, a staff member modeled the techniques, other members of the group practiced it, and the entire group acted as the class during each demonstration" (p. 85).

Barris and Bennett (1969) arranged methods of delivery according to the experience level they had on learners. They defined a high degree of experience level as taking place when "the learner is most likely to interact with the learning situation in such a way that the experience will . . . affect his later behavior" (p. 34). According to Barris and Bennett,

the concept which the learner experiences may be thought of as being related to three characteristics of the learning situation. The first of these is the extent to which he can control the content of the experience. . . . The second characteristic is whether or not the learning experience is multisensory. And of multisensory stimuli increases the probability that the learner will become involved in the learning situation. Finally, whether communication is one way or two way will influence the similarity of perception and affect confidence in what has been communicated. (p. 34)

Barris and Bassett stated that when lectures, illustrated lectures, and demonstrations are used, the learner is essentially passive, with the instructor controlling the structure and content of the activity. They recommended interviewing, brainstorming, group discussions, and buzz sessions to provide the learner with some control of the content of instruction and also to provide two-way communication. Role-playing was described as a high experience impact activity because participants control the content, the learning situation is self-referent, and communication is two-way in two-person role-playing. Guided practice had the same sort of experience impact as role-playing. Guided practice included interviewing and student teaching. Barris and Bassett concluded that

the differences among the various activities mentioned above would suggest that some are better for certain in-service purposes than others. In general, tasks that have higher experience impact take more time and skill and require more materials and equipment. The question confronting the designer is what activities will give the desired outcomes at the least cost. (p. 38)

Based on the literature, the following criteria are recommended for methods of delivery for substitute teacher preparation programs:

1. Methods of delivery should maximize experience impact for in-service participants where appropriate (e.g., role-playing and guided practice).
2. Videotapes should be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.
3. Videotapes should be used to record the performance of in-service participants.

Performance Evaluation of Substitute Teachers

Schuck (1984a, press) reported that researchers have tended to view the evaluation of substitute teachers as a part of supervisor instruction (HVE) concluded that

administrators and supervisors are placed in a forced position to provide on-the-job supervision for the substitute teacher without creating a correspondence to the substitute teacher . . . [by] (a) making periodic classroom visits and holding end-of-the-day conferences, (b) assisting the substitute teacher to acquire materials and supplies, and (c) conducting evaluations of the substitute teacher's services. (pp. 124-125)

Keller (1984) recommended that the principal visit the substitute teacher's class occasionally to make sure the students are behaving. She described this practice as being a "good morale booster," and stated that "most substitutes are only too willing to receive help" (p. 17). She also reported that the principal's visit would provide an opportunity to check on what the substitute is doing.

The DES, in a 1977 survey, found that "38.2 percent of all responding school systems formally evaluate the performance of their substitute teachers [and that the] building principal performs the evaluation in 58.7 percent of the school systems" (p. xii). The DES also found that "substitute teachers are most often evaluated after each assignment [in 58.8 percent of all responding school systems]" (p. vii).

Schuck, in his study of substitute teacher service in Florida, found that less than 200 of the districts reported the formal evaluation of substitute teachers. "When they were evaluated, it was most frequently accomplished by the building principal and the teacher who was absent" (p. 146).

According to Jensen and Yussell (1990), shifts in school system policy and expectations led supervisors and administrators to "assume positive, motivating positions to give counsel and conduct evaluation sessions with the substitute teachers to improve instruction and to create a better working relationship" (p. 87). Kraft (1990) stated that in order to strengthen and improve the substitute teacher's services, his or her work should be evaluated at regular intervals (p. 100). He further recommended that "school districts . . . provide supervisory services to advise substitutes at regular intervals as ways to "improve their teaching methods" (p. 111). French (1981) expressed the view that "most persons who substitute do a good job and have a strong desire to be effective and efficient. They will appreciate a principal's efforts aimed at helping them to do a good job" (p. 71). Drake (1981), stating that "substitutes must be shown that a good teacher . . . [makes] a difference" (p. 78), cited criteria to "select and judge substitute teachers who are qualified to practice their craft" (p. 78). He divided the criteria into four groups—suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics (p. 78). Krasner (1981) emphasized that "evaluation and feedback are necessary for improvement in the substitute teacher program" (p. 114) but need not be carried out by an administrator, rather they can be accomplished as an "optional, teacher-initiated evaluation dealing with task accomplishment and performance, summary of accomplishments, and maintenance of the physical environment. [and can] provide added incentive to the substitute teacher as well as serve as an excellent source of feedback" (p. 114). Krasner stated

(the general absence of formal administrative evaluation is significant, as only 38.3% of substitute teachers are evaluated after each assignment" (p. 33). Because ISFT's make recommendations to 'assign specific classroom teachers to help substitutes working in their grade levels or department (and to) develop and consistently use formal evaluation procedures to assess the performance of substitute teachers' (p. 48).

Based on the literature, the following criteria are recommended for the performance evaluation of substitute teachers:-

1. Substitute teachers should be evaluated at regular intervals.
2. Substitute teachers should be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics.
3. Substitute teachers should be provided with feedback after each evaluation.
4. Evaluations may be conducted by an administrator or other specially trained staff member.

A Composite List of the Recommended Criteria

The initial question for which an answer was sought in the present study was related to the recommended criteria in the literature relative to the preparation of substitute teachers. The following criteria resulted from a review of the literature. The criteria represent recommendations relative to program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, and performance evaluation of substitute teachers:-

1. A planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities should be included:-

3. An action section which provides for studying problems, assuming roles, and reacting to situations should be included.
4. A measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data should be included.
5. A feedback and interpretation section in which data are presented, compared, and contrasted should be included.
6. A new action section which provides for follow-up in-service efforts should be included.
7. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teachers.
8. Substitute teachers should be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures.
9. Substitute teachers should be instructed in state liability laws pertaining to education.
10. Substitute teachers should be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures.
11. Substitute teachers should be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques.
12. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district policies.
13. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.
14. Substitute teachers should be instructed on how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers.

14. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the principles of learning.
15. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.
16. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to develop cross-curricular links in the subject-matter areas.
17. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to operate audio-visual equipment.
18. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to fill out required school forms.
19. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to motivate students.
20. Methods of delivery should include experience input for in-service participants where appropriate (e.g., role-playing and guided practice).
21. Videotapes should be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.
22. Videotapes should be used to record the performance of in-service participants.
23. Substitute teachers should be evaluated at regular intervals.
24. Substitute teachers should be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics.
25. Substitute teachers should be provided with feedback after each evaluation.

96. Evaluations may be conducted by an administrator or other specially trained staff member.

CHAPTER III
OPINIONS OF PRACTITIONERS RELATIVE TO THE SELECTED CRITERIA
FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION

Interviews were conducted in three Florida school districts to collect data on the opinions of practitioners relative to the selected criteria for substitute teacher preparation. In each of the school districts a principal, the director of staff development, two regular teachers, and two substitute teachers were interviewed. An interview guide (Appendix A), which was developed from the recommended criteria in Chapter II, was used in each of the interviews.

The purpose of the present chapter is to present the interview data on the opinions of the practitioners relative to the criteria for substitute teacher preparation and to compare these data with the recommended criteria derived from the literature. Consistent with Chapter II, the data are organized into sections on program organization, candidate content, methods of delivery, and performance evaluation. The data are presented in tabular and narrative form and in narrative form only when tabulation is not practical.

Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Program Organization
for Substitute Teacher Preparation

The 18 practitioners were asked to answer yes or no to five questions relative to program organization for substitute teacher preparation. Each question was related to a recommended criterion in Chapter II. All of the practitioners responded to each of the five questions.

Question 1 relates to the first criterion recommended in the program organization section of Chapter 11 and was expressed as follows:

Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities?

As can be seen in Table 1, 18 (55.6%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. Of the substitute teachers, 83.33 responded yes, and of the regular teachers, 83.33 responded yes. All of the principals and directors of staff development answered yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the principals and directors of staff development to 83.33 for the substitute teachers and regular teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 16.67 for the substitute teachers and regular teachers to 0% for the principals and directors of staff development.

Regarding the second recommended criterion from Chapter 11, question 2 was developed for the interview guide:

Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include an action section which provides for studying problems, assessing needs, and reacting to situations?

As can be seen in Table 2, 18 (55.6%) of the practitioners answered yes to the question. Of the substitute teachers, 83.33 answered yes. 83.33 of the regular teachers and principals responded yes. Of the directors of staff development, 83.33 answered yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers and principals to 83.33 for the directors of staff development, and the range of negative responses was from 16.67 for the directors of staff development to 0% for the regular teachers and principals.

Table 2

Executives' Responses to the Matter of the a. Proprietary Process for Substantive Teachers' Needs Include an Action Plan for Addressing the Teacher's Problems, Resolving Conflicts, and Meeting of School Year

Response	Substantive Teachers		Teacher Leaders		Principal/s		Directors of study development		Totals	
	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	5	11.3	0	100	0	100	0	100.0	0	100.0
No	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	16.7
Total	6	28.0	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	116.7

Question 3 was expressed as follows:

Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data?

As can be seen in Table 3, 84 (85.8%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. Of the substitute teachers, 84.7% responded yes; all of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development responded yes to the question. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 84.7% for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 15.3% for the substitute teachers to 0% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 4 was expressed as follows:

Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a feedback and interpretation section in which measurement data are presented, compared, and analyzed?

As can be seen in Table 4, 74 (83.3%) of the practitioners answered yes to the question. Of the substitute teachers, 84.7% responded yes; all of the regular teachers and principals answered yes; and 84.7% of the directors of staff development answered yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers and principals to 84.7% for the substitute teachers and directors of staff development, and the range of negative responses was 15.3% for the substitute teachers and directors of staff development to 0% for the regular teachers and principals.

Question 5 was expressed as follows:

Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a new action section which provides for follow-up in-service efforts?

Table 3

Prescriptions for doing so. In addition to the attention to legal prescription programs, the Institute Teachers Group has been a national action plan (1990) to reduce the use of corporal punishment, which is also a national action plan.

Response	Subjective Teachers		Applied Teachers		Principals		Direction of staff development		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	4	16	0	100	0	100	0	100	10	10
No	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Total	4	26	0	100	0	100	0	100	10	20

Table 4

Practitioners' responses to the question on how a preparation program for debilitated teachers would provide a feedback and implementation system to allow practitioners to use the feedback, support, and consultation

Responses	Satisfaction to teachers		Teacher feedback		Participation		Provision of study development		Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes	4	06.7	0	100	3	100	1	66.7	10	100.0
No	7	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	7	16.7
Total	4	100	0	100	3	100	2	100	17	100

As can be seen in Table 3, 17 (88.4%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question-- Of the substitute teachers, 82.3% responded yes, all of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development responded yes-- Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff to 82.3% for the substitute teachers, and the range of the negative responses was from 17.7% for the substitute teachers to 0% for all other respondents.

Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Curriculum Content for Substitute Teacher Preparation

The practitioners were asked to respond yes or no to 14 questions relative to curriculum content for the preparation of substitute teachers-- Each question was related to a recommended criterion in Chapter 10-- All of the practitioners responded to the 14 questions

Question 8 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher?

As can be seen in Table 4, all of the practitioners responded yes to this question.

Question 7 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures?

As can be seen in Table 5, all of the practitioners answered yes to this question.

Question 6 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in state liability laws pertaining to education?

As can be seen in Table 6, all of the practitioners answered yes to this question.

Table 3

Teachers' Assessment in Meeting of Bill's Preparation Committee for Substitute Teachers Should Include a New Action Section Which Contains the Following Elements

Response	Substitute Teachers		Regular Teachers		Per my grade		Of my grade (if staff development)		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes	3	100.0	4	100	3	100	3	100	13	100.0
No	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16.6
Total	4	100	4	100	3	100	3	100	14	100

Table 3

Participants' responses as to whether or not substitute teachers should be instructed in the designated area and their of the substitute teacher

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Principals		Directors of staff development		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	0	700	6	100	3	300	3	100	10	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	700	6	100	3	300	3	100	10	100

Table 7

Practitioners' Responses to the Question on How Substantive Teachers Should Be Inducted to Form Effective and Productive Teachers

Response	Substantive Teachers		Regular Teachers		Principals		Directions of study developed			Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Yes	6	100	6	100	3	100	3	100		18	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total	6	100	6	100	3	100	3	100		18	100

Table 4

Practitioners' responses as to whether or not substitute teachers should be instructed in the 2010a (adding) law regarding to practice

Responses	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Principals		Directors of staff development		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes	4	100	4	100	3	100	3	100	14	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	100	4	100	3	100	3	100	14	100

Question 8 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures?

As can be seen in Table 9, all of the practitioners answered yes to this question.

Question 10 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques?

As can be seen in Table 10, 17 (44.4%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. Of the substitute teachers, 43.3% responded yes; all of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development responded yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 43.3% for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 56.7% for the substitute teachers to 0% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 11 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be restricted in school district policies?

As can be seen in Table 11, 17 (44.4%) of the practitioners responded yes to this question. The affirmative responses of the practitioners were as follows: substitute teachers, 44.4%; regular teachers, 50%; principals, 44.4%; and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the directors of staff development to 44.4% for the regular teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 50% for the regular teachers to 0% for the directors of staff development.

Table 2

Teacher's responses as to whether or not substitute teachers should receive incentives to discourage the use of substitutes and principals

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Principals			Directors of state departments			Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1	2
Yes	6	100	4	700	3	100	3	100	11	100		
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total	6	100	4	700	3	100	3	100	11	100		

Table 12

Preschoolers' responses as to whether or not Substitute Teachers Should Be Designated in Suburban Public Schools by their age (by every five years)

Response	Substitute Teachers		Appar. Teachers		Principals		Directors of Public Schools		Total	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Five	5	42.3	8	100	3	100	3	100	10	100.0
Six	1	16.7	8	0	8	0	0	0	1	0.0
Total	6	100	16	100	11	100	3	100	11	100

Table 11

Teachers' Agreement to be elected as Regular Teachers, by Sex, District, and School District

Response	School District		Regular Teachers		Principals		Directors of state development		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Yes	4	84.7	3	60	2	64.7	3	100	12	64.7
No	0	15.3	0	40	1	35.3	0	0	0	35.3
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	3	100	12	100

Question 11 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives?

As can be seen in Table 10, 12 (75.2%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 44 (74); regular teachers, 66 (75); principals, 66 (75); and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the directors of staff development to 66.7% for the substitute teachers, regular teachers, and principals, and the range of negative responses was from 23.3% for the substitute teachers, regular teachers, and principals to 0% for the directors of staff development.

Question 12 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers?

As can be seen in Table 12, 15 (33.3%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 43 (33); regular teachers, 61 (70); principals, 100%; and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the principals and directors of staff development to 43.3% for the regular teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 33.3% for the regular teachers to 0% for the principals and directors of staff development.

Question 14 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in the principles of learning?

As can be seen in Table 14, 12 (66.7%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows:

Table 12

Instructional resources in the number of full substitutes/teachers should be distributed to School Districts for early, middle, and late sections

Response	Substitute Teachers		Regular Teachers		Principals		Directors of staff development		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	4	64.7	4	64.7	2	64.7	3	100	11	79.3
No	3	20.3	2	33.3	1	20.3	0	0	6	27.8
Total	4	100	4	100	3	100	3	100	18	100

Table 12

Participants' responses as to whether or not individual features should be automated in new to function or already existing systems (see Table 11 for information properties)

Response	Substitute features		Original features		prioritize		direction of priority development		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	0	63.3	4	86.7	3	100	3	100	15	63.3
No	1	16.7	2	33.3	0	0	0	0	3	16.7
Total	1	100	6	100	3	100	3	100	18	100

Table 14

‘Professional’ teachers as to whether or not substitute teachers should be instructed in the development of language

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Principals		Directors of county development		Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes	3	40	5	42.3	2	64.7	2	44.7	10	64.7
No	3	40	1	16.7	1	20.3	1	11.3	4	16.7
Total	6	100	6	100	3	100	3	100	14	100

substitute teachers, 50%; regular teachers, 83.3%; principals, 44.7%, and directors of staff development, 44.7%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 83.3% for the regular teachers to 50% for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 50% for the substitute teachers to 16.7% for the regular teachers.

Question 18 was stated as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students?

As can be seen in Table 15, 4 (10.0%) of the practitioners responded yes to this question, whereas 32 (80.0%) responded no. The negative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 80%; regular teachers, 83.3%; principals, 44.7%; and directors of staff development, 44.7%. Thus the negative responses ranged from 83.3% for the regular teachers to 80% for the substitute teachers, and the positive responses ranged from 50% for the substitute teachers to 16.7% for the regular teachers.

Question 19 was stated as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to develop interdisciplinary units in the subject-matter areas?

As can be seen in Table 16, 11 (83.3%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 44.7%; regular teachers, 50%; principals, 44.7%, and directors of staff development, 44.7%. Thus the affirmative responses were from 44.7% for substitute teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 50% for regular teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 50% for the regular teachers to 25.0% for the substitute teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Table 16

Instructional Activities as to Whether or Not Substitute Teachers Should be Instructed in How to Set Goals at the Appropriate Levels of BIP (2 to 7) for Students

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Principals		Percent of staff who respond			Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	N	%
Yes	3	90	7	14.7	3	55.2	1	33.3		6	34.7
No	3	90	3	10.3	2	44.7	2	66.7		12	65.3
Total	6	100	10	100	5	100	3	100		18	100

Table 16

Prescriptions: Response to the Question of How Substituted Teachers Would be Induced to Stop the Deviating
 Behaviour (1991-92) (N = 100) (Source: Author, 1993)

Response	Substituted Teachers		Regular Teachers		Proficiency		Incentives or Staff Development		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	4	40.0	3	30	2	20.0	2	20.0	11	44.4
No	2	20.0	3	30	1	10.0	1	10.0	7	27.8
Total	6	100	6	100	3	100	3	100	18	100

Question 17 was stated as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to operate audio-visual equipment?

All of the practitioners answered yes to this question.

Question 18 was stated as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to fill out required school forms?

As can be seen in Table 16, 16 (68.8%) of the practitioners responded yes to this question. Of the substitute teachers, 66.7% responded yes and all of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development responded yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 66.7% for the substitute teachers; and the range of negative responses was from 33.3% for the substitute teachers to 0% for the teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 19 was stated as follows:

Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to motivate students?

As can be seen in Table 15, 16 (67.8%) of the practitioners answered yes. The affirmative responses were as follows: the substitute teachers, 66.7%; regular teachers and principals, 66.7%; and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the directors of staff development to 66.7% for the regular teachers and principals; and the range of negative responses was from 33.3% for the regular teachers and principals to 0% for the directors of staff development.

Table 17

Recruitment: Response to the selection of Not Substitute Teachers Group's by professional in New to Georgia Public School Teachers

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Participants		Divisions of staff development		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	0	100	0	100	1	100	1	100	10	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	100	0	100	1	100	1	100	10	100

Table 1a

Participating Teachers as the Author or the Substitute Teachers Would be Interviewed in the 1991-1992 School Year

Response	Substitute Teachers		Regular Teachers		Principals		Directors of staff development		Total	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Yes	4	15.7	6	100	3	100	3	100	16	16.7
No	3	30.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11.1
Total	4	100	6	100	3	100	3	100	19	100

Table 18

Participants' Language as a function of Sex, Individual Teachers' Gender, and Instructional Materials (English)

Language	English teachers		Spanish teachers		Participants		Overlaps of study development		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Yes	8	18.2	4	18.2	2	45.5	3	100	14	23.8
No	1	18.2	2	18.2	1	20.5	0	0	4	20.2
Total	9	36.4	6	36.4	3	66	3	100	18	44

Opinions of Practitioners Relative to Methods of Delivery
for a Substituted Teacher Preparation Program

The 38 practitioners were asked to respond yes or no to three questions relative to methods of delivery for a substitute teacher preparation program. The questions were derived from the recommended criteria in Chapter II. All of the practitioners responded to each of the three questions.

Question 20 was stated as follows:

Should methods of delivery maximize experience impact for in-service participants where appropriate?

As can be seen in Table 20, 16 (38-50) of the practitioners answered yes to the question. The affirmative responses were as follows: 12 of the substitute teachers, 41-75 responded yes; 100% of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development responded yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 41-75 for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was 21-25 for the substitute teachers to 0% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 21 was stated as follows:

Should videotapes be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors?

As can be seen in Table 21, 17 (38-45) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 83-100; regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 83-100 for the substitute teachers, and the range of

Table 20

Small Owners' Responses as to whether or Not Methods of Reducing Monthly Expenses Impact for Is-Served Participants More or Less

Response	Is-Served Locations		Regular Locations		Principal's		Locations of Staff developed		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	0	61.7	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	66.7
No	2	23.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.1
Total	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100

Table II

Participants' Responses as to Whether or Not Students Should Be Exposed to Semistructured Research Training Activities

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		Participants		Numbers of study respondents			Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1
Yes	0	40.3	0	100	1	100	1	100	17	14.3	
No	1	14.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	
Total	0	100	0	100	1	100	1	100	18	100	

negative responses was from 18.75 for the substitute teachers to 25 for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 22 was expressed as follows:

Should principals be used to record the performance of in-service participants?

As can be seen in Table 22, 16 (73.3%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 46.75, regular teachers, 51.46, principals and directors of staff development, 100. Thus the range of affirmative responses was 100 for principals and directors of staff development to 46.75 for substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was 33.25 for substitute teachers to 25 for principals and directors of staff development.

Opinions of Practitioners Relating to Performance Evaluation of Substitute Teachers

The 18 practitioners were asked to respond to six questions relative to performance evaluation of substitute teachers. They were asked to respond yes or no to the first four questions. All of the practitioners responded to each of the six questions.

Question 23 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be evaluated at regular intervals?

As can be seen in Table 23, 16 (88.8%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. Of the substitute teachers, 46.75 answered yes whereas all of the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development answered yes. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100 for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 46.75 for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was 33.25 for the substitute teachers and 25 for all others.

Table 20

Prescriptions' Responses as to Whether or Not Physicians Should Be Paid to Report Performance of In-lieu-of-Service Activities

Response	Identifiable Prescriptions		Regular Prescriptions		Physicians		Directions of Staff and Spots		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	4	66.7	5	63.3	3	100	3	100	15	63.3
No	2	33.3	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	2	16.7
Total	6	100	6	100	3	100	3	100	17	100

Table 20

Percentage of employees at the location of the Substitution Taskers Should Be Involved at Regular Intervals

Response	Substitution taskers		Regular taskers		Percentage		Percentage of staff (employed)		Total	
	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	1
Yes	4	66.7	6	100	2	100	3	100	16	88.9
No	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.1
Total	6	133	6	100	2	100	3	100	18	100

Question 24 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics?

As can be seen in Table 24, 25 (73.3%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 48.75; regular teachers, 63.33; and principals and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the principals and directors of staff development to 48.75 for the substitute teachers, and the range of negative responses was from 33.33 for the substitute teachers to 0% for the principals and directors of staff development.

Question 25 was expressed as follows:

Should substitute teachers be provided with feedback after each evaluation?

As can be seen in Table 25, 14 (38.8%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows: substitute teachers, 44.75; regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development to 44.75 for the substitute teachers; and the range of negative responses was 33.33 for the substitute teachers to 0% for the regular teachers, principals, and directors of staff development.

Question 26 was expressed as follows:

Should evaluations be made by an administrator or other specially trained staff member?

As can be seen in Table 26, 14 (37.5%) of the practitioners answered yes to this question. The affirmative responses were as follows:

Principals' Responses to 30 March 1971 Self-Selection Teachers' Study: by Category of Regional Training Institute, Regional Response Center, and National Response Center, and Summary Percent

Response	Self-Select Teachers		Regional Teachers		Principal's		Director of study development		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	4	86.7	8	85.3	2	100	3	100	19	85.3
By	2	50.0	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	3	14.7
Special	2	100	4	100	2	100	3	100	16	100

Table 25

Preschoolers' Responses to Questions on All Substantive Teachers Should be Provided with Feedback after
 Each Lesson

Response	Substantive teachers		Support teachers		Principals		Directors of staff development		Total	
	5	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Yes	4	64.7	0	100	1	100	2	100	16	100.0
No	2	31.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.1
Total	6	100	0	100	1	100	2	100	18	100

Table 26

Profilometers' responses as to whether or not additional further evaluations should be conducted by an additional or other specialty facility listed below.

Response	Solid/Soft Profilometers		Rigid/Soft Profilometers		Artificial parts		Directions of staff per response			Total		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Yes	3	60	5	83.3	3	100	3	100	3	100	14	70.0
No	3	60	1	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	20.0
Total	6	120	6	100	3	100	3	100	3	100	18	100

substitute teachers, 58%; regular teachers, 53.26, and principals and directors of staff development, 100%. Thus the range of affirmative responses was from 100% for the principals and directors of staff development to 58% for the substitute teachers; and the range of negative responses was from 58% for the substitute teachers to 0% for the principals and directors of staff development.

Question 27 was stated as follows:

Where should in-service training for substitute teachers be conducted, at the school level, district level, or at both levels?

The respondents were asked to indicate their choice. As can be seen in Table 27, 66.7% of the substitute teachers indicated that in-service training for substitute teachers should be conducted at the school level; 66.7% of the regular teachers, 66.7% indicated that it should be conducted at the district level and 33.3% indicated that it should be conducted at the school level. All of the principals and all of the directors of staff development indicated that it should be conducted at both levels.

Question 28 was stated as follows:

How many hours do you recommend for a preparation program for substitute teachers?

The respondents were asked to indicate a length of time. Table 28 shows that 66.7% of the substitute teachers indicated in the range of 1-40 hours and 33.3% indicated in the range of 41-60 hours. The percentages of responses of the regular teachers were 76.7% for 1-40 hours, 66.6% for 41-60 hours, and 16.7% for 61-100 hours. The percentages of responses for the principals were 33.3% for 41-60 hours and 66.7% for 61-100 hours.

Table 27

Instructional Personnel: Response is to Where Instructional Personnel are Substituted Teachers. Should be completed at the school level. (Table 27) at School Level

Response	Substitute teachers		Regular teachers		principals		Directors of public schools		Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
School level	2	34-5							2	11,1
Director level	4	56-7	4	66-7					8	46-45
Both levels			2	33-5	3	100	3	100	8	46-45
Total	4	160	6	100	3	100	3	100	18	100

Table 26.

Projections: January 11, 2010 (the Number of Hours Estimated for a Preparation Period of Sixty Days)

Number of Hours	Number of Leads		Number Leads		Price (pts)		Number of Staff employees		Total	
	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Total		Total		Total		Total		Total	
1-10	4	66.7	1	76.7					4	27.8
11-20	2	77.8	4	88.9	1	22.2			7	30.0
21-30	0		1	16.7	2	66.7	3	100	4	22.2
Total	4	100	6	180	3	100	3	100	11	100

All of the directors of staff development recommended a length of time within the range of 75-100 hours. Of the total practitioners, 72.25 recommended 81 or more hours.

Responses of the Practitioners to Item 1

Table 25 shows the total percentages of responses from the practitioners relative to substitute teacher preparation. Each of the practitioners interviewed responded to questions 1-25 on the interview guide. None of the practitioners made additional suggestions in the areas of program organization, curriculum content, methods of delivery, or performance evaluation.

Table 25

Total Percentages of Practitioners' Responses Relative to Substitute Teacher Preparation

	Percent	
	Yes	No
<u>Program Organization</u>		
1. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities?	88.9	11.1
2. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include an activity section which provides for studying problems, discussing roles, and reacting to situations?	88.9	11.1
3. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data?	88.9	11.1
4. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a feedback and interpretation section in which respondents' data are presented, compared, and interpreted?	88.9	11.1

Table 23—(continued)

	Percent	
	Yes	No
5. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a new action section which provides for follow-up in-service efforts?	94.4	5.6
<u>Curriculum content</u>		
6. Should substitute teachers be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher?	100	0
7. Should substitute teachers be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures?	100	0
8. Should substitute teachers be instructed in state liability laws pertaining to education?	100	0
9. Should substitute teachers be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures?	100	0
10. Should substitute teachers be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques?	94.4	5.6
11. Should substitute teachers be instructed in school district policies?	88.3	11.7
12. Should substitute teachers be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives?	75.3	24.7
13. Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers?	83.3	16.7
14. Should substitute teachers be instructed in the principles of learning?	88.3	11.7
15. Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students?	73.3	26.7
16. Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to develop self-course skills in the subject-matter area?	87.3	12.7
17. Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to operate audiovisual equipment?	100	0

Table 25—(continued)

		Percent	
		Yes	No
18	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to fill out required school forms?	94.8	15.1
19	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to motivate students?	77.8	22.2
<u>Methods of delivery</u>			
20	Should methods of delivery include experience reports for in-service participants where appropriate?	98.8	1.1
21	Should videotapes be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors?	94.8	5.2
22	Should videotapes be used to record the performance of in-service participants?	83.2	16.7
<u>Performance evaluation</u>			
23	Should substitute teachers be evaluated at regular intervals?	98.8	1.1
24	Should substitute teachers be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics?	93.7	16.2
25	Should substitute teachers be provided with feedback after each evaluation?	98.8	1.1
26	Should evaluations be made by an administrator or by another specially trained staff member?	77.8	22.2
27	Where should in-service training for substitute teachers be conducted?		
	school level <u>11.11</u> district level <u>48.15</u> both <u>40.83</u>		
28	How many hours do you recommend for a preparation program for substitute teachers?		
	1-40 <u>27.27</u> 41-80 <u>28.79</u> 81-160 <u>23.78</u>		
29	What additional suggestions would you make in regard to designing a preparation program for first-year substitute teachers?		

Comparison of the Interview Results with the Recommended Criteria

Program Organization

As noted in Chapter II, there were five recommended criteria (K1-K5) derived from the literature relative to program organization for substitute teacher preparation.

1. A planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities should be included.
2. An action section which provides for studying problems, assessing values, and reacting to situations should be included.
3. A measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data should be included.
4. A feedback and interpretation section in which data are presented, compared, and contrasted should be included.
5. A new action section which provides for following in-service efforts should be included.

In regard to the recommended criteria on program organization for substitute teacher preparation, as can be seen in Table 29, 89.8% of the practitioners agreed with recommended Criterion 1, 88.8% agreed with recommended Criterion 2, 89.8% agreed with recommended Criterion 3, 88.8% agreed with recommended Criterion 4, and 84.8% agreed with recommended Criterion 5.

Curriculum Content

As noted in Chapter II, there were 14 recommended criteria (K6-K19) derived from the literature relative to curriculum content for substitute teacher preparation.

4. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher.
5. Substitute teachers should be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures.
6. Substitute teachers should be instructed in state liability laws pertaining to education.
7. Substitute teachers should be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures.
8. Substitute teachers should be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques.
9. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district policies.
10. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.
11. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers.
12. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the principles of learning.
13. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.
14. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to develop microsystems skills in the subject-matter areas.
15. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to operate audio-visual equipment.
16. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to fill out required school forms.
17. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to motivate students.

In regard to the recommended criteria on curriculum content, as can be seen in Table 24, 100% of the practitioners agreed with recommended Criterion 4, 100% agreed with recommended Criterion 7, 100% agreed with recommended Criterion 8, and 100% agreed with Criterion 9. Of the practitioners interviewed, 58.43 agreed with recommended Criterion 10, 46.75 agreed with recommended Criterion 11, 33.25 agreed with recommended Criterion 12, 63.25 agreed with recommended Criterion 13, 46.75 agreed with recommended Criterion 14, 33.25 agreed with recommended Criterion 15, 63.15 agreed with recommended Criterion 16, 100% agreed with recommended Criterion 17, 66.75 agreed with recommended Criterion 18, and 33.25 agreed with recommended Criterion 19.

Methods of Delivery

As noted in Chapter 13, there were three recommended criteria (20-22) derived from the literature relative to methods of delivery for a substitute teacher preparation program.

- 20- Methods of delivery should involve experience (such as for in-service participants where appropriate [e.g., role-playing and guided practice])
- 21- Videotapes should be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.
- 22- Videotapes should be used to record the performance of in-service participants.

In regard to the recommended criteria on methods of delivery, as can be seen in Table 25, 66.66 of the practitioners agreed with Criterion 20, 75.43 agreed with Criterion 21, and 63.25 agreed with Criterion 22.

Performance Evaluation

As noted in Chapter 11, there were four recommended criteria (D23-D26) derived from the literature relative to performance evaluation for substitute teachers:

- 23. Substitute teachers should be evaluated at regular intervals.
- 24. Substitute teachers should be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics.
- 25. Substitute teachers should be provided with feedback after each evaluation.
- 26. Evaluations may be conducted by an administrator or other specially trained staff member.

In regard to the recommended criteria on performance evaluation of substitute teachers, as can be seen in Table 26, 88.82 of the practitioners interviewed agreed with Criterion 23, 81.36 agreed with Criterion 24, 68.00 agreed with Criterion 25, and 73.68 agreed with Criterion 26.

Comparison Again? In Brief

The above 26 criteria resulted from a review of the literature and interviews with practitioners relative to substitute teacher preparation. A majority of the practitioners agreed with all of the literature-derived recommended criteria except one, Criterion 15, only 33.33 of the practitioners agreed with Criterion 15.

CHAPTER IX DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM

The second phase of the study was the development of the model preparation program, which was done by comparing the criteria derived in phase one with Gossett's [1984] guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers. The criteria and the guidelines were combined to form modified training components. The modified training components were then compared with Lawrence's [1984] Principles of Effective In-service Education. The results from this comparison were used to prepare a model preparation program for first-year substitute teachers.

Comparison of the Criteria with Gossett's Guidelines for In-service Training Programs for Substitute Teachers

Gossett's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers are presented as three training components (see Tables 35, 36, and 37).

The organization of Gossett's training components is consistent with Criterion 1 in the inclusion of specific objectives and procedures (activities), but the training components do not include materials to be used during the in-service sessions. The activities section of the training components is consistent with Criterion 2. The activities section of the training components provides for studying problems, analyzing roles, and reacting to situations. The evaluation section of the

Table 30

Outline of Training Component 1

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PROGRAM
(Three hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with a comprehensive body of information regarding major elements of the school district's substitute teacher program.

Participants include substitute teachers, regular teachers and school-level and district administrators (participants as presenters and facilitators).

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To identify, for prospective substitute teachers, school district policies, practices, and procedures implemented in the administration of the substitute teacher program.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: When implemented in this activity, the participants will:

1. Identify their school district's goals and objectives.
2. Acquire knowledge of the Substitute Teacher Recruitment process as a vehicle for employment and subsequent promotion.
3. Understand the method of assignment of substitute teachers to a daily position.
4. Identify selected alternatives to utilization of daily substitute teachers in the absence of the regular teacher.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Attend introductory group feature discussion (Specific objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4)
2. Complete an application for employment and certification as a substitute teacher (Specific objective 2)

EVALUATION:

1. Participants will complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component 1.
2. Participants will be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussions for formative evaluative purposes.

Table 30—(continued)

-
- | | |
|----|--|
| 3. | Participants will successfully complete the school district's application for substitute teacher employment. |
| 4. | Participants will complete a portfolio on the objectives in Training Component I., with 80% accuracy. |
| 5. | Participants will complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district. |
-

Note. From *Guidelines for Inservice Training Program for Substitute Teachers*, P. 28, doctoral dissertation in preparation, by J. Soenen, 1984.

Table 31

Outline of Training Component 31

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO SELECTED GENERIC SKILLS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING
(Eighteen hours)

MAJOR DESCRIPTION:

This component is designed to enable participants to obtain or reinforce specific techniques and competencies of effective substitute teaching.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To enable substitute teachers to applying selected generic domains of effective teaching, as established by the State of Florida.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators include regular teachers and school and district-level administrators.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Upon involvement in the activities of this component, the participants will:

1. Demonstrate the ability to orally communicate information to students in a coherent and logical manner.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, orally understood style, using appropriate grammar and sentence structure.
3. Demonstrate their ability to comprehend and interpret a message after listening.
4. Demonstrate their ability to read, comprehend, and interpret, orally and in writing, professional materials, including the regular teachers' lesson plans and instructions.
5. Demonstrate their ability to motivate students by utilizing verbal and/or visual organizational devices.
6. Provide directions for presentation of an instructional activity.
7. Utilize a set of classroom routines and procedures for the distribution and care of materials.
8. Formulate standards for student behavior in the classroom, identify causes of classroom misbehavior, and employ a technique or techniques for correcting it.
9. Identify behaviors which reflect an intolerance of the worth and dignity of varied cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and economic groups.
10. Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept, and in interacting constructively with their peers.

Table 30a (continued)

11. Demonstrate teaching skills which assist students in developing and clarifying their own values, attitudes, and beliefs
12. Identify the varied instructional needs of exceptional students, including those mainstreamed into regular classrooms

ACTIVITIES:

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators. (Specific objectives 8, 9, 10, and 12)
2. Participate in role plays of various situations in the classroom
3. Engage in oral and written exercises. (Specific objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6)
4. React to assigned readings and presentations and give oral reports on specific topics. (Specific objectives 1 and 4)
5. Analyze critically readings, audio- and/or videotapes of classroom effectiveness and relate these to the local needs of the district's educational program. (Specific objectives 8 and 12)
6. Watch demonstrations demonstrating appropriate educational and instructional techniques, to be critiqued by peers and facilitators. (Specific objectives 4, 8, and 10)
7. Participate in sharing activities designed to clarify participants' values, attitudes, and beliefs, and to further share awareness of the importance of the affective domain in teaching. (Specific objectives 8, 10, and 11)

EVALUATION

1. Participants will complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component II.
2. Participants will be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussions, oral presentations, and simulations and role plays, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Participants will complete a posttest on the objectives in Training Component II, with 80% accuracy.
4. Participants will complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

Table 28

Outline of Training Component III

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO CURRICULUM (three hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with a general overview of curricula approved by the school district.

Participants include substitute teachers. Facilitators include regular teachers, school-level curriculum administrators, and district curriculum coordinators.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To assist substitute teachers in identifying instructional goals and related learning activities for selected subject areas.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: After involvement in the activities of this training component, the participants will:

1. Identify district long-range goals in specific subject areas.
2. Develop individual learning activities for students.
3. Demonstrate techniques for modifying materials to meet students in meeting an objective.
4. Identify alternative activities to achieve an instructional objective.
5. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of class and individual student progress.
6. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and work with fundamental language arts, mathematical, science, and social studies concepts.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, and administrators. (Specific objectives 1 and 2)
2. Develop, in small groups, individual learning activities for instructional objectives in a given subject area, and share these activities with other small groups. (Specific objectives 3, 4, and 6)
3. Attend a demonstration on adaptation of instructional materials to meet pre-stated objectives. (Specific objectives 3, 4, and 6)

Table 20—(continued)

-
4. Complete sample of district-approved class record form.
(Specific objective 6)

EVALUATION

1. Participants will complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component III.
 2. Participants will be assessed by Trainers on their self-group and individual written work, for formative evaluation purposes.
 3. Participants will complete a posttest on the objectives of Training Component III, with 80% accuracy.
 4. Participants will complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.
-

Source: From *Guidelines for Inservice Training Programs for Substitute Teachers*, p. 78, National Association for Preparation of Substitute Teachers, 1982.

training components is consistent with Criterion 3. The evaluation section allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data.

Component 1 training components do not specify a feedback and interpretation section (Criterion 4) nor do they identify a new action section which provides for follow-up inservice efforts (Criterion 5).

The contents of Component 1 are consistent with Criteria 11 and 12. School district policies, goals, and objectives are identified for prospective substitute teachers.

The contents of Component 11, Objective 9, are consistent with Criteria 8 and 12. Standards for student behavior in the classroom are formulated, causes of classroom misbehavior are identified, and techniques for correcting the behavior are employed.

The contents of Component 11, Objectives 10 and 11, are consistent with Criterion 12. Emphasis is placed on developing skills that assist students in developing and learning rather than on dispensing information to students.

The contents of Component 11, Objective 8, are consistent with Criterion 12. Prospective substitute teachers must demonstrate their ability to motivate students by utilizing verbal and/or physical motivational devices.

The contents of Component 11, Activities 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, are consistent with Criterion 12. Prospective substitute teachers must participate in role plays of various situations in the classroom, engage in oral and written exercises, read to assigned readings and presentations, and give oral reports on specific topics. Prospective substitute

teachers must analyze readings and audio-visual videotapes of classroom instruction and relate these to the local needs of the district's educational programs, teach students, and participate in sharing activities. These activities provide experiential impact for the in-service participants. (Criterion 20)

The contents of Component II, Activity 3, are consistent with Criterion 21. Videotapes are used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.

The contents of Component III, Objective 3, are consistent with Criteria 14 and 15. The principles of learning must be employed to demonstrate techniques for modifying materials to meet students in learning in objective.

The contents of Component III, Objectives 4 and 5, are consistent with Criterion 16. Prospective substitute teachers must demonstrate the ability to comprehend and work with fundamental concepts in the language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies by developing individual learning activities for students (independent units).

The contents of Component III, Specific Objectives 4 and 5, are consistent with Criterion 16. Prospective substitute teachers must be able to fill out required school forms.

Sonnet's training components did not include Criterion 17 and 18. In Sonnet's training components there was no provision for prospective substitute teachers to be instructed in the use of audio-visual equipment (Criterion 17) or to be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures (Criterion 18).

The contents of the evaluation sections of Components I, II, and III are consistent with Criteria 23, 24, and 25. The training

components include formative and summative evaluation activities. Provisions for feedback after each evaluation (Criterion 34) are not specified in the training components.

Table 35 shows the location of the criteria derived from the literature and the opinions of practitioners in the guidelines (components) developed by Soenen. Of the 36 criteria derived from the literature and the opinions of practitioners, 11 were present in the guidelines developed by Soenen.

Modification of Soenen's Training Components

Soenen's guidelines (training components) and those criteria which were not specified in the guidelines were continued to form modified training components. A materials section (Criterion 1) was added to Training Components I, II, and III. Criterion 4, which provides for a feedback and interpretation section, and Criterion 5, which provides for follow-up in-service efforts, were added to Component I. Component I was also modified to include Criterion 6, which provides for instructions on the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher, and Criterion 8, which provides for instructions on state liability laws pertaining to education. Criteria 8 and 9 were added to the component as Specific Objectives 3 and 4 respectively. The title of the component was changed to "Orientation for Substitute Teachers."

Component II and III were modified to include a feedback and interpretation section (Criterion 4) and a follow-up in-service section (Criterion 5). Component III was also modified to include provisions for instructions on fire drill and emergency procedures.

Table 23

Locations of Criteria Derived From the Literature and Guidelines of Practitioners in the National Guidelines (Components) Developed by NIOSH

Criteria	Guidelines
1	Components I, II, and III
2	Components I, II, and III
3	Components I, II, and III
4	Not specified in guidelines
5	Not specified in guidelines
6	Not specified in guidelines
7	Not specified in guidelines
8	Not specified in guidelines
9	Component II (Specific Objective 8)
10	Component II (Specific Objective 8)
11	Component I (general objective)
12	Component I (Specific Objective 1)
13	Component II (Specific Objectives 10 and 11)
14	Component III (Specific Objective 3)
15	Component III (Specific Objective 3)
16	Component III (Specific Objectives 3 and 4)
17	Not specified in guidelines
18	Component III (Specific Objective 5, Activity 4)
19	Component II (Specific Objective 6)
20	Component II (Objectives 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7)
21	Component II (Activity 3)
22	Not specified in guidelines
23	Components I, II, and III
24	Components I, II, and III
25	Not specified in guidelines
26	Components I, II, and III

(Criterion 7) and provisions for instruction in the use of audio-visual equipment (Criterion 17). Additions 3 and 4 were added to Component III.

The total number of in-service training hours was changed from 24 to 40. Of the practitioners interviewed (Chapter III), 78.2% indicated that the training period of substitute teachers should be 40 or more hours, only 21.8% indicated that it should be less than 40 hours.

Tables 24, 25, and 26 show the training components (guidelines) developed by Gosson with modifications. The criteria derived from the literature and opinions of practitioners were used to modify Gosson's training components.

Coverage of the Modified Training Components with Lawrence's Criteria of Effective In-Service Education

Lawrence (1976) conducted an extensive investigation of the literature to determine whether generalizations could be drawn about the kinds of settings, materials, and procedures that lead to effective in-service education for teachers. After reviewing 27 studies, he found clear evidence that differences in materials, procedures, and designs were associated with differences in effectiveness of in-service education (p. 43).

Lawrence's findings that are related to this study are as follows:

- IA. In-service programs in schools and in college campuses are equally capable of affecting teacher behavior, but the school settings tend to be capable of influencing more complex behavior changes in teachers. . . .
- IB. Teacher attitudes are more likely to be influenced in school-based than in college-based in-service programs. . . .
- IC. Microcourses sponsored either by colleges or schools tend to emphasize the development and application of specific teaching skills, with corresponding lower emphasis on beliefs, values, concepts, and information objectives. Microcourses have a high rate of success in achieving the specific skill objectives. . . .
- ID. An infusion of instruction is broadly inappropriate or distinctly inferior to the accomplishment of the objectives of in-service education. . . .

Table 34

Training Component 1 (Continued)

TITLE: ORIENTATION FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS (Three Hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants information on the school district and the school district's substitute teacher program.

Participants are substitute teachers. Regular teachers and school- and district-level administrators participate as presenters and facilitators.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To identify, for prospective substitute teachers, school district policies, practices, and procedures implemented in the administration of the substitute teacher program.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Given involvement in this activity, the participants will:

1. Identify their school district's goals and objectives.
2. Understand the method of assignment of substitute teachers to a daily position.
3. Understand the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher.
4. Identify flexibility laws relative to education.
5. Acquire knowledge of the substitute teacher recruitment process as a method for assignment and subsequent promotion.
6. Identify selected alternatives to utilization of the daily-substitute teacher in the absence of the regular teacher.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will

Attend triweekly group lecture/discussion (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6)

MATERIALS:

EVALUATION: Deliverer(s) will:

1. Complete a project on the completion of Training Component 1.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussion, for formative evaluation purposes.

Table 38—(continued)

-
3. Complete with HRD agency a portrait on the objectives in Training Component 1.
 4. Complete the standard participant's evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INFORMATION: Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants

NEW ACTION: Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Note: Adapted from *Guidelines for Inservice Training Programs for Substitute Teachers*, p. 47, National Association for Professional Staff Nurses, 1982.

Table 28

Component II (Modified)

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO SELECTED GENERIC DOMAINS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING
[Twenty Hours]

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

This component is designed to enable participants to obtain or reinforce specific techniques and competencies of effective substitute teaching.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

To assist substitute teachers in applying selected generic domains of effective teaching, as established by the State of Florida.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers and school- and district-level coordinators.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Upon involvement in the activities of this component, the participants will

- 1- Demonstrate the ability to communicate orally information to students in a coherent and logical manner.
- 2- Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, easily understood style, using appropriate grammar and sentence structure.
- 3- Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and interpret a message after listening.
- 4- Demonstrate the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret, orally and in writing, professional material, including the regular teachers' lesson plans and instructions.
- 5- Demonstrate the ability to motivate students by utilizing verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
- 6- Provide directions for the presentation of an instructional activity.
- 7- Establish a set of classroom routines and procedures for the organization and care of materials.
- 8- Formulate standards for student behavior in the classroom, identify causes of classroom misbehavior, and employ a technique or techniques for correcting it.
- 9- Identify behaviors which reflect an acknowledgment of the worth and dignity of varied cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and economic groups.
- 10- Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept and in interacting constructively with their peers.
- 11- Demonstrate teaching skills which assist students in questioning and clarifying their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.

Table 20--(continued)

12. Identify the varied instructional needs of exceptional students, including those mainstreamed into regular classrooms.

ACTIVITY 10: Participants will

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 6, 7, 8, and 12)
2. Participate in role plays of various situations in the classroom. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 11)
3. Engage in oral and written exercises. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6)
4. Read to individual meetings and presentations and give oral reports on specific topics. (Specific Objectives 1 and 4)
5. Analyze critically meetings, radio- and/or videotapes of classroom instruction and relate them to the local needs of the district's educational program. (Specific Objectives 5 and 12)
6. Teach mini-lessons demonstrating appropriate behavioral and instructional techniques, to be critiqued by peers and facilitators. (Specific Objectives 4, 5, and 6)
7. Participate in sharing activities designed to clarify their own values, attitudes, and beliefs, and to further their awareness of the importance of the effective domain in teaching. (Specific Objectives 6, 10, and 11)

MEASURE:**EVALUATION: Participants will**

1. Complete a pretest on the importance of Training Component II.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussions, oral presentations, and simulations and role plays, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80% accuracy a posttest on the objectives in Training Component II.
4. Complete the classroom participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND IMPLEMENTATION: Instructors will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants.

NEXT ACTION: Instructors will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Table 34

Component 7.1 (Revised)TITLE: ORIENTATION TO CURRICULUM (Eighteen years)BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with a general overview of curricula approved by the school district.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers, school-level curriculum administrators, and district curriculum coordinators.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To assist substitute teachers in identifying instructional goals and related learning activities for selected subject areas.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: After involvement in the activities of this training component, the participants will

1. Identify district long-range goals in specific subject areas.
2. Develop individual learning activities for students.
3. Demonstrate techniques for modifying materials to assist students in meeting an objective.
4. Identify alternative activities to achieve an instructional objective.
5. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of classroom individual student progress.
6. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and work with functional concepts in the language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.
7. Demonstrate fire drill and emergency procedures.
8. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified non-visual equipment.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, and 7)
2. Develop, in small groups, individual learning activities for instructional objectives in a given subject area, and share these activities with other small groups. (Specific Objectives 2, 4, and 5)
3. Attend a demonstration on the operation of instructional materials to meet prescribed objectives. (Specific Objectives 2, 4, and 8)

Table 34—(continued)

-
4. Complete samples of district-approved class record forms. (Specific Objective 5)
 5. Attend a demonstration on the operation of audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 5)
 6. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 5)

MATERIALS**DISCUSSION:** Participants will

1. Complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component III.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their staff-group and individual in-service work, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80% accuracy a posttest on the objectives of Training Component III.
4. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION: evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants.

RES ACTION: Evaluators will

Provide follow-up in-service learning for participants needing remediation.

Note: Adapted from *Guidelines for Inservice Training Programs for Sub-
Illness Teachers*, p. 12, doctoral dissertation in preparation by J.
Gower, 1984.

- IIIb Video and roleplaying are effective as means of influencing teacher behavior in classroom management settings.
- IIIc Studies that have specific studies of a topic or topics as a method of individual report a high degree of program effectiveness.
- IIId School-based programs in which teachers participate as helpers to each other and planners of inservice activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than do programs which are conducted by college or other outside personnel without the assistance of teachers.
- IIIf School-based programs in which supervisors or administrators serve as helpers and planners tend to be more successful in accomplishing their objectives than do programs which are conducted by college or other outside personnel without the assistance of supervisors or administrators.
- IIIc School-based programs conducted by supervisors and/or administrators have a record of effectiveness which suggests that of school-based programs that involve college or other outside personnel.
- IVa Objectives of inservice education that deal with changing teacher's store of information have a high rate of realization; objectives dealing with overt teaching behaviors are less often realized; and objectives involving changes in teacher attitudes or values are least often realized.
- IVb The success rate of inservice education programs is substantially higher when change in teaching behavior is the intention rather than when subsequent change in pupil behavior is the intention.
- IVc Inservice education programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (that is, "individualized") are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants.
- IVd Inservice education programs that place the teacher in an active role (constructing and generating materials, ideas, and behaviors) are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that place the teacher in a receptive role. . . . (p. 10-11)

Effective Pattern II and II facilitate that in-service training should be conducted in schools rather than in college campuses. Each modified component is appropriate for delivery in a school setting.

Effective Pattern III indicates that microcourses have a high rate of success in the development and application of specific teaching skills. The program is divided into three distinct components, each of which is appropriate for delivery as a microcourse. Each modified component is complete, with objectives, materials, evaluation, feedback to participants, and provision for following inservice activities if appropriate.

While Effective Pattern IIIA indicates that no medium of instruction is distinctly inferior, Effective Pattern IIB indicates that video- and videotaping are effective as means of influencing teacher behavior in classroom management skills. A broad range of instructional strategies is suggested in the model preparation program. Video- and videotaping are specifically called for in the orientation to the effective teaching model.

Effective Pattern IIC indicates that programs that make specific reference of a book or books as means of instruction are highly effective, but only 10% of the studies made reference to books. According to Lawrence, "books apparently play a very subordinate role in in-service education" (p. 18). There were no books available to cover the specific objectives of the modified components.

Effective Pattern IIIA indicates that school-based programs in which teachers participate as helpers in each other and planners of in-service activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than programs which are conducted by college or other outside personnel without the assistance of teachers. The modified components do substitute teachers involve regular teachers as presenters and facilitators. Substitute teachers participate as helpers to each other, but they do not participate as planners of the in-service activities.

Effective Pattern IIIB indicates that school-based programs in which supervisors or administrators serve as helpers and planners tend to be more successful in accomplishing their objectives than programs which are conducted by college or other outside personnel without the

involvement of supervisors or administrators. The modified components for substitute teachers involve administrators and/or supervisors as promoters and facilitators.

Effective Pattern III indicates that school-based programs conducted by supervisors and/or administrators have a record of effectiveness which exceeds that of school-based programs that involve college or other outside personnel. The modified components were designed to be conducted by district supervisors and/or administrators.

Effective Pattern III indicates that objectives of in-service education that deal with changing teachers' concepts or reinforcing their store of information have a high rate of realization, objectives dealing with overt teaching behaviors are less often realized, and objectives involving changes in teacher attitudes or values are least often realized. Lawrence stated that "of the twenty-seven studies reviewed, twenty-nine had eight objectives involving changes in overt teaching performance, forty had objectives concerned with teacher attitudes, and thirty had objectives that would be classified as cognitive or 'informational objectives'" (p. 13). Of 88 specific objectives in the modified training components, 78 (88%) are related to overt teaching performance and 7 (8%) are related to cognitive or informational objectives.

Effective Pattern IV indicates that the success rate of in-service education programs is substantially higher when change in teaching behavior is the criterion rather than when subsequent change in pupil behavior is the criterion. None of the objectives of the modified training components have pupil outcomes as a criterion. 87% of the objectives of the modified components are teacher related.

Effective Pattern 8A indicates that in-service education programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (i.e., individualized experiences) are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants. There were no provisions in the components for differentiated training experiences for different teachers.

Effective Pattern 9B indicates that in-service education programs that place the teacher in active roles are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that place the teacher in a receptive role. Of the 28 specific objectives in the modified training components, 18 (64%) require active participation by the participant in order to meet the evaluation standards.

Effective Pattern 9C indicates that in-service education programs that emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials, and feedback are more likely to accomplish their goals than are programs in which the teacher is expected to state up ideas and behavior prescriptions for a future time. A total of 23 of the specific objectives and 82% of the related activities emphasize demonstrations, role-playing, participation in small-group-sharing activities, and reacting to varied classroom situations. Each component of the program has a feedback and interpretation section where evaluation data are shared with the participants.

In brief, the unified training components for substitute teachers were consistent with 18 of the 23 patterns of effective inservice education. The components were not consistent with three of the patterns of effective inservice education, 10E, 10F, and 9B.

Programs that made specific mention of a book or books as a means of instruction had a high degree of program effectiveness, as reported in Effective Pattern 2C. However, the modified components did not specify a book as a means of instruction.

Effective Pattern 22A indicates that school-based programs in which teachers participate as helpers to each other and planners of in-service activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than programs which are conducted by colleges or other outside personnel without the assistance of teachers. The modified components specify that substitute teachers participate in small group activities, but they were not involved in planning in-service activities. There were no provisions in the modified components for substitute teachers to participate as presenters or as facilitators.

Effective Pattern 2B states that in-service education programs with differentiated training experience for different teachers (i.e., individualized experiences) were more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that had common activities for all participants. There were no provisions in the modified components for differentiated training experiences for different teachers.

Projection of the Model Preparation Program

As a result of the comparative data obtained in the previous section, the model preparation program for first-year substitute teachers was projected to include Effective Patterns 2C, 22A, and 2B. Tables 2C, 2A, and 2B show the projected model preparation program for first-year substitute teachers.

Table 37

Model Preparation Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers: Training Component 1

TITLE: ORIENTATION FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS (Three hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with information on the school district and the school district's substitute teacher program.

Participants are substitute teachers. Presenters and facilitators are regular teachers, school- and district-level administrators, and substitute substitute teachers.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To identify, for prospective substitute teachers, school district policies, practices, and procedures implemented in the substitute teacher program.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Upon involvement in this activity, participants will

1. Identify their school district's philosophy, goals, and objectives;
2. Understand the method of assignment of substitute teachers to a daily position;
3. Understand the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher;
4. Identify state liability laws related to education;
5. Acquire knowledge of the substitute teacher recruitment process as a method for employment and subsequent promotion;
6. Identify various alternatives to utilization of the daily substitute teacher in the absence of the regular teacher.

ADDITIONAL: Participants will

1. Attend introductory group lecture/discussion. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, and 6)
2. Read handbook for substitute teachers. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6)

MATERIALS

- 1- Overhead projector
- 2- Substitute Teacher Handbook
- 3- Presenters and posters

Table 32—(continued)

EVALUATION: Participants will

1. Complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component I. Participants scoring 80% or better on the pretest may be exempted from completing this training component.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussions, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80% accuracy a posttest on the objectives in Training Component I.
4. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION: Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants

NEW ACTION: Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Table 28

Field Experience Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers – Training Component II

TABLE: ORIENTATION TO SELECTED GENERIC DOMAINS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING (Twenty Hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

This component is designed to enable participants to obtain or reinforce specific techniques and considerations of effective substitute teaching.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

To assist substitute teachers in applying selected generic domains of effective teaching, as established by the State of Florida.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers, school- and district-level coordinators, and successful substitute teachers.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Given involvement in the activities of this component, the participants will:

1. Demonstrate the ability to communicate orally information to students in a coherent and logical manner.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, easily understood style, using appropriate grammar and sentence structure.
3. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and interpret a message after listening.
4. Demonstrate the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret, orally and in writing, professional material, including the regular teachers' lesson plans and instructions.
5. Demonstrate the ability to motivate students by utilizing verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
6. Provide directions for presentation of an instructional activity.
7. Establish a list of classroom routines and procedures for the utilization and care of materials.
8. Formulate standards for student behavior in the classroom, identify causes of classroom misbehavior, and employ a technique or techniques for correcting it.
9. Identify behaviors which reflect an disrespect of the worth and dignity of racial/ethnic, linguistic, ethnic, and economic groups.

Table 20—(continued)

10. Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept, and in interacting constructively with their peers.
11. Demonstrate teaching skills which assist students in developing and clarifying their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.
12. Identify the varied instructional needs of exceptional students, including those mainstreamed into regular classrooms.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 8, 9, 10, and 12)
2. Participate in role plays of various situations in the classroom. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11)
3. Express in oral and written statements. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10)
4. Read assigned readings and presentations and give oral reports on specific topics. (Specific Objectives 1 and 4)
5. Analyze critically readings and audio-visual videotapes of classroom instruction and relate these to the local needs of the district's educational program. (Specific Objectives 5 and 12)
6. Teach techniques demonstrating appropriate motivational and instructional techniques, to be critiqued by peers and facilitators. (Specific Objectives 4, 5, and 10)
7. Participate in sharing activities designed to clarify their own values, attitudes, and beliefs, and to further their awareness of the importance of the affective domain in teaching. (Specific Objectives 5, 10, and 11)

MATERIALS:

Audio- and videotapes, cassette players and video cassette recorders, district-ordered textbooks, pencils, paper, protractors, and postcards.

EVALUATION: Participants will

1. Complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component II. Participants scoring 80% or better on the pretest may be exempted from completing this component.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussion, oral presentation, simulations and role plays, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80% accuracy a posttest on the objectives in Training Component II.
4. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

Table 28—(continued)

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION: Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants.

NEW ACTION: Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Table 20

Basic Preparation Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers: Training Component 1a

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO CURRICULA (Highways course)

GROUP DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with a general overview of curricula approved by the district.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers, school-level curriculum administrators, district curriculum coordinators, and successful substitute teachers.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To assist substitute teachers in identifying instructional goals and related learning activities for selected subject areas.

SPECIFIC DESCRIPTIONS: Given involvement in the activities of this training component, the participant will:

1. Identify district long-range goals in specific subject areas.
2. Develop individual learning activities for students.
3. Demonstrate techniques for modifying materials to assist students in achieving an objective.
4. Identify alternative activities to achieve an instructional objective.
5. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of class and individual student progress.
6. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and work with fundamental concepts in the language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.
7. Understand fire drill and emergency procedures.
8. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified audiovisual equipment.

ACTIVITIES:

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, curriculum administrators, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, and 7)
2. Develop, in small groups, individual learning activities for instructional objectives in a given subject area, and share these activities with other small groups. (Specific Objectives 3, 4, and 6)

Table 35—(continued)

-
3. Attend a demonstration on the adaptation of instructional materials to meet preselected objectives. (Specific Objectives 3, 4, and 5)
 4. Complete samples of district-approved class record forms. (Specific Objective 5)
 5. Attend a demonstration on the operation of audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 5)
 6. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 5)

MATERIALS

1. Samples of class records
2. Specified audio-visual equipment
3. Samples of district-approved textbooks
4. Protocols and protocols

EVALUATION Participants will

1. Complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component III. Participants scoring 75% or better on the pretest may be exempted from completing this training component.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their small-group and individual written work, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80% accuracy a posttest on Training Component III.
4. Complete the standard participants evaluation form submitted by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with the in-service participants.

NEW ACTION? Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Effective Pattern III was included in the model by developing a substitute teacher handbook and specifying that in-service participants read the handbook in addition to the activities listed in the model. The handbook would include the information and objectives of the model program. Effective Pattern III indicates that programs that make specific mention of a book as a means of instruction have a high degree of program effectiveness.

Effective Pattern IIIA was included in the model by specifying that substitute teachers participate as helpers to each other and as planners of in-service activities. Selected substitute teachers with successful performance evaluations were added as presenters and facilitators in the training program. Effective Pattern IIIB indicates that school-based programs in which participants help each other and participate in the planning of the in-service activities tend to have greater success in accomplishing their objectives than programs conducted by college or other outside personnel without the assistance of participants.

Effective Pattern III was included in the model by specifying in the evaluation section that all participants be contacted on each component of the model, and that those participants who score 80% accuracy or better on the pretest be exempted from completing that particular training component. Effective Pattern III indicates that in-service education programs which provide differentiated learning experiences for different teachers are more likely to accomplish their objectives than programs that have common activities for all participants.

CHAPTER 8 EVALUATION AND FINAL REVISION OF THE MODEL

This chapter is divided into five sections. First, there is a discussion of the collection of the responses to the evaluation questionnaire completed by the three-member expert panel. Second, the results of the questionnaire responses are presented. Third, there is a discussion of the coverage data and the evaluation results. This is followed by recommendations for improving the model and the final revision of the model.

Collection of the Evaluation Responses

The model was evaluated by a panel of experts consisting of three knowledgeable persons: a staff member of a university teacher center who provided a minimum of six days of in-service training each month, a district director of staff development, and a principal.

A questionnaire was developed (Appendix K) from the 26 criteria derived from the literature and interviews with 18 practitioners. The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses as to whether or not the criteria were incorporated in the model. A 5-point scale was developed for the questionnaire: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) no opinion, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree.

The questionnaires were delivered to each panelist. Follow-up telephone calls were made after the deadline to encourage return of the questionnaires. All of the questionnaires were subsequently returned

Frequency distributions were used to tabulate the experts' responses as to whether or not the model conformed to the criteria. If two of the three experts' responses to any question fell at level 4 (agree) or above, the model was assumed to conform to that criterion. Each panelist was invited to submit additional suggestions for improving the model.

Qualitative Results

Responses to the evaluation questionnaire can be seen in Table 40. A total of 25 questions were developed for the evaluation questionnaire. As can be seen from Table 40, the panel of experts was very consistent in rating the items as (5) strongly agree or (4) agree, with the exception of items 22, 23, and 24. Items 22, 23, and 24 each received one rating of (3) no opinion, but because the responses of two of the three panel members' rating an item as strongly agree or agree was deemed as sufficient for the model to be considered as conforming to an item, the model conforms to each of the 25 items. Each member of the panel of experts rated the model as strongly agreeing to 19 items on the questionnaire. The panel did not disagree or strongly disagree on the model's conformity to any item.

The model is consistent with the items on the evaluation questionnaire which were derived from the criteria for a preparation program for substitute teachers. Of the 25 responses to the questionnaire by the panel of experts, 20 (80%) indicated strong agreement between the model and the questionnaire items. A total of 7 (28%) indicated agreement between the model and questionnaire items, and 3 (12%) indicated no opinion.

Table 40

Results of the Panel of Experts' Responses to the Evaluation
Panel Comments

Item	Degree of agreement					
	strongly agree	agree	no opinion	disagree	strongly disagree	
1. Specific objectives, materials, and activities are identified in the model...	3					
2. The utilization section of the model provides for studying problems, assessing risks, and reacting to situations...	3					
3. The evaluation section of the model provides for assessing the accomplishment of objectives...	3					
4. The feedback and interpretative section of the model allows one to present evaluation data to participants...	3					
5. The new action section of the model allows one to provide follow up desirable knowledge when modification is needed...	3					
6. The model provides for adequate instruction in the responsibilities and duties of substitute teachers...	3					
7. The model provides for adequate instruction in fire drill and emergency procedures...	3					
8. The model provides for adequate instruction in state liability laws...	3					
9. The model provides for adequate instruction in disciplinary policies and procedures...	3					
10. The model provides for adequate instruction in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques...	3					
11. The model provides for adequate instruction in school district policies...	3					

Table 40—(continued)

Item	Degree of agreement					
	Strongly agree	Agree	In no opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree	
12. The model provides for adequate informing in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.	3					
13. The model provides opportunities for applying the principles of learning.	2	1				
14. The model provides opportunities for participants to learn how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.	2	1				
15. The model provides opportunities for participants to develop weaknesses in subject-matter areas.	3					
16. The model provides an opportunity for instruction in operating audio-visual equipment.	3					
17. The model provides an opportunity for participants to fill out required school forms.	3					
18. The model provides an opportunity for participants to demonstrate how to motivate students.	3					
19. The model provides opportunities for mastering experiential inquiry (role-playing and guided practice).	2	1				
20. Feedback is made in the model for using audio-and/or videotapes to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.	2	1				
21. The model provides opportunities for participants to be evaluated at regular intervals.	3					

Table 48—(continued)

Item	Degree of agreement				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know or no answer
23. The model provides opportunities for participants to be evaluated on suggested teaching standards	3				
24. The model provides opportunities for participants to be evaluated on recommended management techniques	2		1		
25. The model provides opportunities for participants to be evaluated on desirable professional attributes and necessary personal characteristics		2	1		
26. The model provides an opportunity for participants to receive feedback after each evaluation	1	1	1		
27. The model emphasizes teaching sub- stitute teachers to function as learning managers rather than information dispensers	3				
Total	68	3	3	0	0

Criterion 14: and Evaluation Results

A summary of the comparison data and evaluation results is shown in table 41. As can be seen from table 41, Criteria 1, 3, 10, 16, 26, 31, and 32 were consistent with the opinions of the practitioners, Gosselin's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers, and Lawrence's patterns of effective in-service education, and the expert panel perceived the model as conforming to these criteria.

Criteria 2, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 24, 25, and 33 were consistent with the opinions of the practitioners and Gosselin's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers. The above 11 criteria were not specifically addressed in Lawrence's Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. The expert panel's evaluation indicated that the model conformed to the above criteria.

Criteria 4, 6, 7, 9, and 8 were consistent with the opinions of the practitioners. None of the five criteria were specifically addressed in Gosselin's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers nor in Lawrence's Patterns of Effective Inservice Education. The expert panel perceived that the model conformed to the above criteria.

Criterion 18 was consistent with Gosselin's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers and Lawrence's patterns of effective in-service education, and the expert panel indicated that the model conformed to this criterion. Only 33.33 of the practitioners indicated that Criterion 18 should be included in a preparation program for substitute teachers.

Criterion 17 was consistent with the opinions of the practitioners and Lawrence's patterns of effective inservice education, and the panel

Table 4b

Summary of Comparison Data and Evaluation Results

Criterion	Criteria considered with			
	Religion of practitioners	Goeman's guidelines	Lawrence's patterns	Expert panel's evaluation of model
1	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X
3	X	X		X
4	X			X
5	X			X
6	X			X
7	X			X
8	X			X
9	X	X		X
10	X	X	X	X
11	X	X		X
12	X	X		X
13	X	X		X
14	X	X		X
15		X	X	X
16	X	X	X	X
17	X		X	X
18	X	X		X
19	X	X		X
20	X	X	X	X
21	X	X	X	X
22	X		X	X
23	X	X		X
24	X	X		X
25	X			X
26	X			X
27	X	X		X

of experts indicated that the model conformed to this criterion. Criterion 17 was not addressed in Gossett's guidelines for supervising training program for substitute teachers.

Recommendations for Improving the Model

All three panelists recommended that Specific Objectives 5 and 6 be eliminated from Training Component I. Two of the three panelists recommended that Specific Objectives 7 and 8 in Training Component III be transferred to Training Component I. Instructions on fire drill(s), emergency procedures, and self-directed certification should be accomplished in orientation. Each of the panelists recommended that the time allocated for Component II be increased from 30 hours to 40 hours. Each of the panelists recommended that the pretext and the option for being exempted from completing Training Component I be eliminated because all substitute teachers need a common orientation program. One panelist also suggested that the pretext for Training Component II include performance activities as well as pencil and paper tests because participants may be able to write a concept and not be able to demonstrate it.

Final Revision of the Model

The decision to retain or reject a data element (criterion, guideline, or effective pattern) from the model preparation program was based on the evaluation of the panel of experts. The model preparation program for substitute teachers was revised consistent with the comparison data and the recommendations of the panel of experts. The final revision of the model preparation program is presented in Tables 42, 43, and 44.

Table 42

Model Preparation Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers: Training Component 1 Overview

TITLE: ORIENTATION FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS (Three hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training segment is designed to provide participants with information on the school district and the school district's substitute teacher program.

Participants are substitute teachers. Presenters and facilitators are regular teachers, school- and district-level administrators, and successful substitute teachers.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To identify, for prospective substitute teachers, school district policies, practices, and procedures implemented in the substitute teacher program.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: After involvement in this activity, the participants will:

1. Identify the school district's philosophy, goals, and objectives.
2. Understand the method of assignment of substitute teachers to a daily position.
3. Understand the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher.
4. Identify state liability laws related to education.
5. Understand fire drill and emergency procedures.
6. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified audio-visual equipment.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will:

1. Attend an introductory group lecture/discussion. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5)
2. Read the handbook for substitute teachers. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, and 4)
3. Attend a demonstration on the operation of audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 6)
4. Demonstrate the ability to operate specified audio-visual equipment. (Specific Objective 6)

Table 41e-(continued)

MATERIALS:

1. Overhead projector
2. Substitute teacher handbooks
3. Pretests and posttests
4. 16 mm projector
5. Filmstrip viewers
6. Video cassette recorder

EVALUATION: Participants will

1. Be assessed by teachers on their performance in group discussions, for formative evaluation purposes.
2. Complete with 80% accuracy a portion of the objectives in Training Component 1.
3. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION: Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants.

NOA ACTIONS: Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Table 4.2

Model Preparation Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers: Course Content (Continued)

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO SELECTED GENERAL DOMAINS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING
(First Years)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

This component is designed to enable participants to obtain or reinforce specific techniques and components of effective substitute teaching.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

To assist substitute teachers in applying selected general domains of effective teaching, as established by the State of Florida.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers, school- and district-level administrators, and successful substitute teachers.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Given involvement in the activities of this component, the participants will:

1. Demonstrate the ability to communicate orally information to students in a coherent and logical manner.
2. Demonstrate the ability to write in a logical, easily understood style, using appropriate grammar and sentence structure.
3. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend and interpret a verbal message.
4. Demonstrate the ability to read, comprehend, and interpret, orally and in writing, professional material, including the regular teacher's lesson plans and instructions.
5. Demonstrate the ability to motivate students by utilizing verbal and/or visual motivational devices.
6. Provide direction for the presentation of an instructional activity.
7. Establish a set of classroom routines and procedures for the utilization and care of materials.
8. Formulate standards for student behavior in the classroom, identify causes of classroom misbehavior, and employ a technique or techniques for correcting it.
9. Identify behaviors which reflect an acknowledgment of the worth and dignity of varied cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and economic groups.
10. Demonstrate instructional and social skills which assist students in developing a positive self-concept and in interacting constructively with their peers.

Table 42—(continued)

11. Demonstrate teaching skills which assist students in developing and clarifying their own values, attitudes, and beliefs.
12. Identify the varied instructional needs of exceptional students, including those who spend less regular classroom.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, counselors, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 8, and 12)
2. Participate in role plays of various situations in the classroom. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, and 12)
3. Engage in oral and written exercises. (Specific Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8)
4. React to assigned readings and presentations and give oral reports on specific topics. (Specific Objectives 1 and 4)
5. Analyze critically readings and audio- and/or videotapes of classroom instruction and relate these to the local needs of the district's educational program. (Specific Objectives 2 and 12)
6. Teach mini-lessons demonstrating appropriate motivational and instructional techniques, to be critiqued by peers and facilitators. (Specific Objectives 4, 8, and 9)
7. Participate in sharing activities designed to clarify participants' values, attitudes, and beliefs, and to further their awareness of the importance of the affective domain in teaching. (Specific Objectives 8, 10, and 12)

MATERIALS:

Audio- and videotapes with cassette players and video cassette recorders, district-adopted textbooks, pencils, paper, proctors, and assistants.

EVALUATION: Participants will

1. Complete a pretest (written and performance activities) at the beginning of Training Component II. Participants scoring 80 or better on the pretest may be exempted from completing this component.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their performance in group discussions, oral presentations, simulations, and role plays, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 80 accuracy a posttest on the objectives in Training Component II.
4. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

Table 4b (continued)

FEEDBACK AND INFORMATION: District(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants

NEW ACTION: District(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

Table 44

Model Preparation Program for First-Year Substitute Teachers... Training Component (a) [continued]

TITLE: ORIENTATION TO CURRICULUM (Eighteen Hours)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

This training component is designed to provide participants with a general overview of curricula approved by the district.

Participants are substitute teachers. Facilitators are regular teachers, school-level curriculum administrators, district curriculum coordinators, and successful substitute teachers.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE:

To assist substitute teachers in identifying instructional goals and related learning activities for selected subject areas.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES: Given involvement in the activities of this training component, the participant will:

1. Identify district long-range goals in specific subject areas.
2. Develop individual learning activities for students.
3. Demonstrate techniques for modifying materials to assist students in mastering an objective.
4. Identify alternative activities to achieve an instructional objective.
5. Identify and/or develop a system for keeping records of class and individual student progress.
6. Demonstrate the ability to understand and work with fundamental concepts in the language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

ACTIVITIES: Participants will

1. Attend lectures and group discussions led by classroom teachers, curriculum coordinators, and administrators. (Specific Objectives 1 and 2)
2. Develop, in small groups, individual learning activities for instructional objectives in a given subject area, and share these activities with other small groups. (Specific Objectives 3, 4, and 5)
3. Attend a demonstration on adaptation of instructional materials to meet prescribed objectives. (Specific Objectives 3, 4, and 5)

Table 44—(continued)

-
4. Complete copies of district-approved class record form (Specific Objective 2)

MATERIALS

1. Copies of class records
2. Specified audio-visual equipment
3. Copies of distributed textbooks
4. Pretests and posttests

EVALUATION—Participants will

1. Complete a pretest at the beginning of Training Component III. Participants scoring 90% or better on the pretest may be exempted from completing this training component.
2. Be assessed by trainers on their unit-group and individual written work, for formative evaluation purposes.
3. Complete with 90% accuracy a posttest on Training Component III.
4. Complete the standard participants' evaluation form supplied by the staff development department of the school district.

FEEDBACK AND INTERPRETATION—Evaluator(s) will

Share evaluation results with in-service participants.

AFS ACTION—Evaluator(s) will

Provide follow-up in-service training for participants needing remediation.

CHAPTER VI SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

A search of the literature revealed the need in Florida for a preparation program for first-year substitute teachers who lack a bachelor's degree and regular teacher certification. This need was shown to exist for the following reasons: (a) the possible employment of substitute teachers holding only a high school diploma, (b) the view that the substitute teacher should provide continuous instruction similar in quality to that provided by the regular teacher, (c) the view that such instruction will not likely be provided unless the substitute teacher has received training, and (d) the lack of uniform state standards for the preparation of substitute teachers.

Also, the literature review revealed that very little interest has been shown by educational researchers in addressing the problem of the preparation of substitute teachers. Therefore, the study reported herein was undertaken.

The purpose of the study was the development and evaluation of a model preparation program for substitute teachers who possess neither a bachelor's degree nor regular teacher certification. The model preparation program was designed for use immediately preceding and during the first year of substitute teacher service. In the development of the model, attention was given to program organization, curriculum content,

method of delivery, and evaluation of the participants in the program. The model was based on (a) critiques derived from the literature relative to substitute teacher preparation, (b) a survey of the opinions of practitioners relative to substitute teacher preparation, (c) guidelines for in-service training program for substitute teachers developed by Gates (1980), and Lawrence's (1974) Patterns of Effective Inservice Education.

At the first phase of the study, a search of the literature on substitute teacher preparation resulted in the selection of 24 criteria:

1. A planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities should be included.
2. An action section which provides for studying problems, accepting roles, and reacting to situations should be included.
3. A measurement section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data should be included.
4. A feedback and interpretation section in which measurement data are presented, compared, and contrasted should be included.
5. A new action section which provides for follow-up in-service efforts should be included.
6. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the responsibilities and duties of the substitute teacher.
7. Substitute teachers should be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures.
8. Substitute teachers should be instructed in state licensing laws pertaining to education.

9. Substitute teachers should be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures.
10. Substitute teachers should be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques.
11. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district policies.
12. Substitute teachers should be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.
13. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers.
14. Substitute teachers should be instructed in the principles of learning.
15. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.
16. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to develop nonconscious skills in the subject-matter areas.
17. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to operate audiovisual equipment.
18. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to fill out required school forms.
19. Substitute teachers should be instructed in how to motivate students.
20. Methods of delivery should maximize experience impact for in-service participants where appropriate (e.g., role-playing and guided practice).
21. Videotapes should be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors.

22. Rintologies should be used to record the performance of in-service participants.
23. Substitute teachers should be evaluated at regular intervals.
24. Substitute teachers should be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, desirable professional attributes, and necessary personal characteristics.
25. Substitute teachers should be provided with feedback after each evaluation.
26. Evaluations may be conducted by an administrator or other specially trained staff member.

Interviews were conducted in three Florida school districts which reportedly had in-service training programs for substitute teachers. A principal, the director of staff development, the regular teachers, and two substitute teachers in each of the three school districts were interviewed by the aid of an interview guide (Appendix A). The interview guide contained questions corresponding to each of the 26 recommended criteria, as well as 3 questions soliciting additional recommendations.

The majority of the practitioners (75.0%) recommended that the in-service training program for first-year substitute teachers without bachelor's degrees be 40 hours or longer. Of the total practitioners, 41.4% recommended that the in-service training for substitute teachers be conducted at the district level, 11.0% at the school level, and 47.6% at both the school level and the district level. The

practitioners did not make additional recommendations concerning program organization, curriculum content, method of delivery, or evaluation.

The 26 criteria derived from the literature and the opinions of the practitioners were compared to the guidelines for in-service training for substitute teachers developed by Goman. Criterion 1, which required that specific objectives be included in the program, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 2, which specified an administrative section, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 3, which specified an evaluation section was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 4, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 10, which indicated that substitute teachers should be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 11, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in school district policies, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 12, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 13, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information processors, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 14, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in the principles of learning, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 15, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 16, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in

how to develop microsource units in the subject-matter areas, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 16, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in how to fill out required school forms, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 18, which specified that substitute teachers be instructed in how to motivate students, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 20, which indicated that methods of delivery should maximize experience impact where appropriate, was consistent with the guidelines. Criterion 21, which specified that videotapes be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors, was consistent with the guidelines. Criteria 23, 24, and 25, which outlined evaluation requirements, were consistent with the guidelines. Criteria 6, 9, 8, 7, 5, 12, 22, and 26 were not specified in the guidelines but were recommended in the literature, were deemed important by the projectors, and therefore were retained in the model.

The combined criteria and guidelines (modified training components) were compared with Lawrence's (1984) Patterns of Effective Learning Education. Effective Patterns 18 and 19 indicated that in-service training should be conducted in schools rather than in college courses. The modified training components were appropriate for delivery in a school setting. Effective Pattern 10 indicated that microsources had a high rate of success in achieving the specific skill objectives. Each modified training component was complete with objectives, activities, evaluation, feedback to participants, etc., and was appropriate for delivery as a microsource. Effective Pattern 11A indicated that in-service of behaviorism was distinctly inferior. A broad range of instructional strategies was recommended in the modified training components. Effective Pattern 11B, which indicated that video- and

colleagues were effective as means of influencing teacher behavior to discontinue nonexpected shift, was consistent with the modified training components. Effective Patterns IIC and E, which indicated that supervisors and/or administrators should serve as presenter, helpers, and planners of in-service training, were consistent with the modified training components. Effective Pattern JIB, which indicated that a change in teaching behavior should be the in-service objective rather than a subsequent change in pupil behavior, was consistent with the modified training components. Effective Pattern IB, which specified that the teacher be placed in an active role, was consistent with the modified training components.

Effective Patterns IIC, IIB, and IB, which were not originally specified in the modified training components, were included in the model. Effective Pattern IIC, which indicated that in-service programs that made specific mention of a book as a source of instruction reported a high degree of program effectiveness, was included by specifying the development of a substitute handbook and requiring that in-service participants read the handbook. Effective Pattern IIB, which indicated that teachers should participate as helpers to each other and as planners of in-service activities, was included by specifying that successful substitute teachers serve as presenters and facilitators in the training program. Effective Pattern IB, which indicated that participants should have differentiated training experiences, was included by specifying that those participants who score 80% or better on the pre-test be exempted from completing that particular training component. After modification to include the three additional patterns, the total preparative program was projected.

In the final phase of the study, a panel of experts evaluated the model preparation program by responding to a questionnaire (Appendix g) containing 36 items corresponding to the 36 criteria. As a result, the panelists made recommendations for improving the model preparation program. With the incorporation of the recommended changes the final version of the model preparation program was projected (Tables 42, 43, and 44).

Conclusions and Implications

Substantively, there are three major conclusions justified by this developmental study. The first conclusion is that the opinions of the surveyed practitioners are consistent with the criteria derived from the literature. The second conclusion is that the criteria are generally congruent with Gossett's guidelines for in-service training programs for substitute teachers. The third conclusion is that the combination of the criteria and the guidelines is generally congruent with Lawrence's Guidelines for Effecting Inservice Education.

The implications seem to be that the model preparation program developed in this study can be used by school districts in Florida that employ substitute teachers without a bachelor's degree and that the model provides a framework for designing in-service education programs for all substitute teachers. The above conclusions and implications seem to be justified by the opinions of the practitioners and the panel of experts.

The model does not include in-depth training in the subject content areas. In-depth subject content instructions were beyond the scope of this study.

Although it was beyond the scope of the study to field test the model, a field test would enhance the validity of the model. Therefore, it is recommended that the model be field tested. It is further recommended that studies be conducted to determine whether substitute teachers trained with this model are more effective in the classroom than substitute teachers not trained with this model.

REFERENCES

- Baldwin, C. E. (1984). Organization and administration of substitute-teaching services in city school settings. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Blanton, R. (1982). Florida Statute 221 Understaffing and implementing the new law. The Florida School Administrator, 31(1), 16-28.
- Cassano, F. M. (1987). The substitute teacher service in the public schools. Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Ellis, J. (1981). Where should substitutes? Thru, 10(1-2), 30-32.
- Evans, J. M. (1981). Finding effective use of the substitute teacher in administrative opportunities. NSRP Bulletin, 30(10), 74-85.
- Education Standards Committee. (1984). Proposed recommendations for changes to State Board of Education Rule 6A-4.04(4) Florida teaching certificate. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education.
- Educational Research Service, Inc. (1987). Practices and procedures in the use of substitute teachers. Washington, WA: Author.
- Gillett, P. G., & Radabaugh, B. C. (1977). The cost of signposting teacher absence. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 369-371.
- Hampton, P. F. (1985). Improving the role of substitute teachers. NSRP Bulletin, 34(10), 47-50.
- Prosch, E. S. (1981). Food for thought: Proper utilization of the substitute teacher. NSRP Bulletin, 30(10), 46-51.
- Seamon, J. (1984). Guidelines for inservice training programs for substitute teachers. Doctoral Dissertation in preparation, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Sarris, B. M., & Bennett, M. (1985). On-service education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-hall.
- Reichow, R. (1981). Substitutes are teachers, too! Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 66.

- Jenkins, R. E., & Russell, R. L. (1978). Substitute teachers: Current status and some suggestions for improvement. NASD Bulletin, 45(3), 44-48.
- Keller, J. A. (1978). Dear teacher, while you were gone. Teacher, 25(18), 76-77.
- Kraft, G. B. (1980). New approaches to the substitute teacher problem. NASD Bulletin, 47(3), 79-84.
- Lawrence, S. (1984). Patterns of effective in-service education. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education.
- Moore, E. H. (1988). A study of personnel, policies, and practices related to substitute teacher service in the public schools of North Carolina. Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 0108-0104. [University Microfilms No. 89-0611]
- McClure, R. E., & Hughes, L. M. (1982). Houston program trains effective substitutes. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 702.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Portney, E. (1980). Getting better results from substitutes, teacher aides, and volunteers. Successful School Management Series. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosen, S. S. (1980). Improving the effectiveness of substitute teachers. NASD Bulletin, 47(10), 61-68.
- Reynolds, B. C., & Gutfeld, L. (1981). Retaining substitute teachers for the urban high school. NASD Bulletin, 48(1), 58-60.
- Schuck, R. J., Jr. (in press). Policies, practices and procedures relative to substitute teachers in Florida school districts. Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1982. ERIC Report. EDRS 342 021.
- Starnes, J. E. (1979). Identification of alternatives appropriate for inclusion in a model program for the selection, placement, and training of substitute teachers in secondary large school systems. Dissertation Abstracts International, 21, 04798-01798. [University Microfilms No. 81-0352]
- Wachtman, S. Jr. (1982). Substitute teachers need supervisory help. Educational Leadership, 39, 155-156.

APPENDIX A
GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWING PRACTITIONERS ASSESSING CRITERIA
FOR A PROGRAM FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER PREPARATION

What is your position?

Director of staff development
Principal
Substitute teacher
Regular teacher

Program Organization

1. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a planning section which specifies objectives, materials, and procedures for in-service activities?	Yes	No
2. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include an action section which provides for studying problems, assessing risks, and reacting to situations?	Yes	No
3. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include an action section which allows one to measure the accomplishment of objectives, record reactions, quantify reactions, and analyze data?	Yes	No
4. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a feedback and interpretation component in which measured data are presented, compared, and contrasted?	Yes	No
5. Should a preparation program for substitute teachers include a new action section which provides for follow-up in-service efforts?	Yes	No

Substitution Content

6. Should substitute teachers be instructed in the proper districts and duties of the substitute teacher?	Yes	No
7. Should substitute teachers be instructed in fire drill and emergency procedures?	Yes	No
8. Should substitute teachers be instructed in state liability laws pertaining to education?	Yes	No

9.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in disciplinary policies and procedures?	Yes	No
10.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques?	Yes	No
11.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in school district policies?	Yes	No
12.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives?	Yes	No
13.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to function as learning managers rather than as information dispensers?	Yes	No
14.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in the principles of learning?	Yes	No
15.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students?	Yes	No
16.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to develop micro-essays which in the subject-matter areas?	Yes	No
17.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to operate audio-visual equipment?	Yes	No
18.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to fill out required school forms?	Yes	No
19.	Should substitute teachers be instructed in how to motivate students?	Yes	No

Methods of Delivery

20.	Should methods of delivery include experience impact for in-service participants where appropriate?	Yes	No
21.	Should videotapes be used to demonstrate appropriate teaching behaviors?	Yes	No
22.	Should videotapes be used to record the performance of in-service participants?	Yes	No

Performance Evaluation

23.	Should substitute teachers be evaluated at regular intervals?	Yes	No
-----	---	-----	----

24. Should substitute teachers be evaluated on suggested teaching standards, recommended management techniques, and necessary personnel characteristics? Yes No
25. Should substitute teachers be provided with feedback after each evaluation? Yes No
26. Should evaluations be made by an administrator or other specially trained staff member? Yes No
27. Where should in-service training for substitute teachers be conducted, at the school level, district level, or both levels? _____
28. How many hours do you recommend for a preparation program for substitute teachers? _____
29. What additional suggestions would you make in regard to designing a preparation program for first-year substitute teachers? _____

APPENDIX B
QUEST FORMS FOR EVALUATION OF THE MODEL PREPARATION PROGRAM
FOR FIRST-YEAR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS

Directions: Please examine carefully the model preparation program for first-year substitute teachers. Then read each of the following statements and circle the number that corresponds to the level of agreement/disagreement you perceive between the statement and the characteristics of the model.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Dis- agree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Specific objectives, materials, and activities are identified in the model	5	4	3	2	1
2	The activities section of the model provides for studying problems, reasoning, reflecting, and reacting to situations.	5	4	3	2	1
3	The evaluation section of the model provides for measuring the acceptable work of substitutes.	5	4	3	2	1
4	The feedback and interpretation section of the model allows one to provide evaluation data to participants.	5	4	3	2	1
5	The new entry section of the model allows one to provide follow-up in-service training when reinforcement is needed.	5	4	3	2	1
6	The model provides for adequate instruction to the responsibilities and duties of substitute teachers.	5	4	3	2	1
7	The model provides for adequate instruction in first entry and emergency procedures.	5	4	3	2	1

Directed system system	system	in system	system	system	system
------------------------------	--------	--------------	--------	--------	--------

8.	The model provides for adequate instruction in state history facts pertaining to education.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	The model provides for adequate instruction in disciplinary policies and procedures.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	The model provides for adequate instruction in behavior modification and other disciplinary techniques.	5	4	3	2	1
11.	The model provides for adequate instruction in school district policies.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	The model provides for adequate instruction in school district philosophy, goals, and objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
13.	The model provides opportunities for applying the principles of learning.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	The model provides opportunities for participants to learn how to set tasks at the appropriate levels of difficulty for students.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	The model provides opportunities for participants to develop relationships in subject-matter areas.	5	4	3	2	1
16.	The model provides an opportunity for instruction in operating audio-visual equipment.	5	4	3	2	1
17.	The model provides an opportunity for participants to fill out required school forms.	5	4	3	2	1
18.	The model provides an opportunity for participants to demonstrate how to motivate students.	5	4	3	2	1
19.	The model provides opportunities for maintaining equipment (e.g., role-playing and guided practice).	5	4	3	2	1
20.	Provision is made in the model for using video- and/or videotaped to demonstrate appropriate learning behaviors.	5	4	3	2	1

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

John Elias Fiddler was born November 19, 1945, in Hawthorne, Florida. He is the sixth child of Elder T. E. and Margarette Fiddler. He grew up in Gainesville, Florida, and attended Lincoln High School through the eleventh grade. After completing the eleventh grade in June 1963, he was admitted to Florida College in Augusta, Georgia, as an early admission student.

His college career was interrupted by a four-year tour of duty in the U.S. Air Force. From 1963 to 1967 he served on active duty, which included a tour of duty at Tan Son Nhut Air Base, Republic of Vietnam.

In September 1967 he resumed college at Florida A. & M. University, Tallahassee, where, in June 1970, he was graduated magna cum laude with the degree of Bachelor of Science with a major in chemistry.

From 1970 to 1972 he was employed as a research chemist by FCB, Inc., Gainesville, Florida. In 1974 he received the degree of Master of Education with a major in secondary education from the University of Florida. While attending the university he taught chemistry for one year at Oak Ridge High School, Oklawaha, Florida.

He has served in the Alachua County school system as a science teacher, mathematics teacher, and dean. In 1975 he was employed as director of the Teaching Center in the Office of Instructional Services at the University of Florida. From 1975 to 1980 he was employed as principal of the A. Orion Jones Exceptional Student Center, Gainesville.

He received the degree of Specialist in Education with a major in educational administration from the University of Florida in 1962. Since 1960 he has served as principal of Ft. Clarke Middle School, Gainesville.

He is married to the former Loretta Jackson, and he is the father of three children, Anita Rogers, John Allen II, and Lathana Deane.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.


James E. Lindgren, Chairman
Associate Professor of Educational
Administration and Supervision

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.


James C. Johnson
Professor of General Teacher Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.


Michael E. Johnson
Professor of Educational Administration
and Supervision

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 1994


David C. Smith
Dean, College of Education

WITH THE OFFICIAL MASTER AND SIGNATURE